Amme İdaresi Dergisi

AİD

Volume 3 Number 2 June 2009

TODAİE'S REVIEW of PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The Criterion Problem in Public Performance Management: Performance Criteria in Administrative Activities
Veysel Eren

Privatized Citizenship: Transformation of Health Care Policies in Turkey
Filiz Kartal

The 'Invisible Hand' Metaphor in Economics and Social Theory
Hüseyin Özel

Education as an Instrument of Social Engineering in the Second Constitutional Monarchy Period: Education Policies of the Committee of Union and Progress (1908 - 1918)
Ercan Uyanık

The Effectiveness of the Decision-Making Process and Strategic Consensus
Senem Besler

Voters of Antakya: Denominational Cleavage and Party Identification
Nizam Önen - Murat Tek

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION INSTITUTE FOR TURKEY AND THE MIDDLE EAST
TODAİE

AİD TODAİE's Review of Public Administration
ISSN 1307-9344

Owner
On behalf of TODAİE
Eyyup G. İSBİR

Editor
Onur Ender ASLAN

Board of Editors
Eyyup G. İSBİR
Onur Ender ASLAN
Meral TECER
Oya ÇİTÇİ
Feyzi ULUĞ

Translations: Belgin EREN

TODAİE's Review of Public Administration is an English edition of Amme İdaresi Dergisi, which is published quarterly by Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East (TODAİE). It may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, without the prior written permission of the publisher. The opinions expressed in these articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of TODAİE.
Articles in the TODAİE's Review of Public Administration are indexed in the national social sciences database of The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey and the database of non-English public administration journals of International Institute of Administrative Sciences-European Group of Public Administration.

Address all correspondence to:
TODAİE, 85. Cadde, No: 8, Yücetepe 06100 ANKARA TURKEY
Tel: +90 312 2317360 Faks: +90 312 2313881
E-mail: todaie@todaie.gov.tr

Öncü Basımevi
Kazım Karabekir Cad., Ali Kabakçı İşhanı, No: 85/2
İskitler ANKARA TURKEY
Tel: 0312 384 31 20 www.oncubasimevi.com

AİD TODAİE's Review of Public Administration

CONTENTS

Volume 3 Number 2 June 2009

The Criterion Problem in Public Performance Management: Performance Criteria in Administrative Activities	*Veysel Eren*	1
Privatized Citizenship: Transformation of Health Care Policies in Turkey	*Filiz Kartal*	25
The 'Invisible Hand' Metaphor in Economics and Social Theory	*Hüseyin Özel*	51
Education as an Instrument of Social Engineering in the Second Constitutional Monarchy Period: Education Policies of the Committee of Union and Progress (1908 - 1918)	*Ercan Uyanık*	75
The Effectiveness of the Decision-Making Process and Strategic Consensus	*Senem Besler*	101
Voters of Antakya: Denominational Cleavage and Party Identification	*Nizam Önen-Murat Tek*	123

Education as an Instrument of Social Engineering in the Second Constitutional Monarchy Period: Education Policies of the Committee of Union and Progress (1908 - 1918)

Ercan Uyanık[*]

Abstract: *The Young Turks demolished the Hamidian regime with the Revolution of 23 July 1908, which they blamed for the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire. Their purpose was to protect the territorial integrity of the Empire and to modernize it. They believed that social progress could only be achieved with the involvement of citizens. According to them, education was a fundamental instrument of reshaping society in the social transformation process. The unionists wanted to enhance the educational level of Muslim Turkish citizens and for this purpose they tried to reach vast numbers of people via formal education as well as press and cultural activities. This study will attempt to investigate the path, which the Committee of Union and Progress followed while transforming society through education in the Second Constitutional Monarchy Period. In this context, the study will focus on the Committee's efforts to shape society by changing the content of school books in line with its ideology for the purpose of inoculating patriotism.*

Key Words: *The Committee of Union and Progress, social engineering, education policies, education, school.*

INTRODUCTION

The exploration of the transformative role of education by the elites in the development process of modern central states is an outcome of profanation and secularization that have gained pace since the second half of the 18th century. The French Revolution of 1789 ensured the sovereignty of the secular and modern way of thinking called 'Enlightenment' that combined with nation-state ideology. With the French Revolution, education started to be taken under state monopoly; following the complementation of the concept 'sovereignty' with national sovereignty, the aim of national education was set as 'bringing up a perfect citizen'. The modern school, which emerged in the West in the early 19th century, replaced the church,

[*] Dr., Dokuz Eylül University, Buca Faculty of Education.

guild and family, institutions responsible for children's socialization. Hence, the 19th century became a period, during which schoolization gained pace and education was gradually popularized. With the spread of education to reach massive dimensions, school has emerged as an institution specialized in socialization (Bumin, 1983: 5-7; Doğan, 1994: 14; Üstel, 2004b: 11-16).

In the 19th century, public education came onto the agenda in the Ottoman Empire, as in all other countries directed towards modernization. With the transformation of reform efforts, which were launched in order to cope with the interior and exterior problems of the Ottoman Empire, into a regular reform program in the Tanzimat Reform Era, the state itself began to deal with education. In accordance with a circular declared in 1857, the Ministry of General Education was established to deal with educational affairs throughout the Empire. The General Education Regulation, enacted in 1869, stipulated that the state would be responsible for offering modern educational services to all subjects of the Empire (Alkan, 2000: 127; Szyliowicz, 2000: 420).

After the Reform Edict of 1856 granted freedom to non-Muslim citizens and foreigners, Catholic missionaries supported by religious circles in France and American Protestant missionaries began to compete for opening schools in the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans, who were closely monitoring the educational activities of non-Muslim communities and missionaries on Ottoman soil, worried that such activities would erase the Ottoman life style and culture, believed that they would be able to respond to these activities by founding their own Western-type schools. Therefore, Ottoman educational initiatives of the 19th century were influenced by the belief that the already weakened Empire was besieged by a number of dangers. Modern educational initiatives, which were deemed equivalent to fighting for the future of the Empire, can be regarded as an effort to blend the rival worldview of the Western world and the Ottoman/Islamic worldview in order to cope with the West's attack on the Empire. The only solution, according to Ottoman administrative elites, who believed that education, which was considered the key to the Western world's success, could easily be adapted to Ottoman conditions, was to choose and adopt Western methods that would serve the interest of the Ottoman best. After education started to be offered as a public service by the state in the Tanzimat Reform Era, Ottoman administrators placed identity formation at the core of Ottoman educational change and struggled to shape the young Ottoman population's views about their Empire. The post-Tanzimat Ottoman educational initia-

tives display similarities to their contemporaries in the world of the 19th century with respect to timing, optimistic spirit, state-guided program and efforts towards creating new citizens/subjects (Fortna, 2005: 67 - 73).

During the Abdülhamit II period, the increase in the number of communities and foreign schools created a competitive environment for the Muslim population of the Empire and Ottoman administrative elites, thus accelerating the opening of Muslim schools. Abdülhamit II, who regarded education as the fundamental instrument of social and national development, endeavored to spread modern schools empire-wide in order to influence the views of his subjects about the Empire. The curriculums and the content of textbooks of the said period reveal that education was considered the primary instrument to be employed for ideological transfer (Alkan, 2001: 377 - 407).[1]

Education institutions developed by Abdülhamit II paved the way for the rise of an anti-Abdülhamit intellectual group and assumed an important socialization function. The idea of establishing a social order different to the existing one became the primary ambition of the social group that achieved choiceness via education as the outcome of the establishment of Western-type schools. 'Western-type education institutions', the most vital tool for cultural westernization, produced an elite group that longed to appropriate the West. The said group, which considered themselves superior to other social elements as it was familiar with the Western world, rendered itself liable to educate, change and guide other social groups. These pro-West elites believed that 'science and technology' were the sole reason for Western

[1] In the Abdülhamit II period, bureaucrats, who served in Arab Provinces and Vilayat-ı Sitte (Eastern Six Provinces) sent numerous reports to Babıâli (Sublime Porte), emphasizing the need for the establishment of modern Ottoman education institutions as a reprisal to the educational attack initiated by missionaries. The most typical examples of these reports are the memorandums sent by Ahmet Şakir Pasha to Mabeyn-i Hümayun Başkitabeti. These memorandums involved Ahmet Şakir Pasha's observations and examinations, which he conducted in Erzurum, Van, Bitlis, Sivas, Malatya, Diyarbakır, Trabzon, Ankara, Kastamonu and Aleppo Provinces within the scope of "Anatolian Reforms". Ahmet Şakir Pasha reported in his memorandums, which he sent to the central administration, that in the abovementioned provinces, Muslim citizens significantly fell behind non-Muslim citizens in terms of education and that educational activities conducted by missionaries were gradually poisoning non-Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire. As a solution, he recommended the immediate establishment of the Ottoman's own education network. For more detailed information, see: (Ali Karaca, Anadolu Islahâtı ve Ahmet Şâkir Paşa (1838 – 1899), İstanbul, 1993, p. 182 -188; Fortna, 2005). For detailed information on the quantitative increase in the number of schools during the Abdülhamit II era, see: (Alkan, 2000: 131 – 198), For detailed information on the spirit of competition awoken by missionary schools in the Ottoman administrative elites, see: (Kieser, 2005).

superiority. This belief brought about the dominance of biological materialism in the Ottoman Turk way of thinking from the last quarter of the 19th century onwards (Hanioğlu, 1985b: 1383). Accordingly, looking at the ideational origin of the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), the Military School of Medicine reflected the influence of 19th century biological materialism. The CUP was comprised of persons, who were included in the administrative class after acquiring eliteness following their education. The majority of its members were modernizationists. As regards the CUP's approach that can be named 'social engineering', it will be helpful to briefly touch on the influence of social theories, which Young Turks became familiar with during their exile in European capitals like Paris, London, Geneva and Zurich.

YOUNG TURKS, ELITISM AND SOCIAL ENGINEERING

Young Turks, who borrowed the idea of previous intellectuals that work was an important virtue for human dignity, aspired to teach people 'laws', which were above everything else, by educating them. Their primary purpose was to show the course of actual development to the Ottoman people, thus turning them into their alliance. As in the beginning, Young Turks were very confident about their role as educator, they clung to the borrowed idea of foreign origin 'populism' wholeheartedly. They believed that they would make the people see the truth by educating them within the 'enlightening-enlightenment' relationship, which they built when they were in the opposition. However, when they realized that people were poorly equipped, they were upset and disappointed. Young Turks quit the idea of popularism because of peoples' failure to fulfill the role given to them in the scenario drawn up by Young Turks as well as the Ottoman social structure that can be roughly described as a combination of common people and the elite. After a while, Young Turks became aware of the difficulties of cooperating with people and, eventually they began to believe that all problems would be settled if science, to which they attributed an excessive meaning, assumed the functions of religion in society. Young Turks, who realized that this idea also had some drawbacks and who had entirely given up hope for people, directed themselves towards the elitist theories of the Western world. They thought that they should continuously tell people about views and ideas of the elite so that people would begin to perceive these views and ideas as their own issues (Hanioğlu, 1985a: 609 - 616).

The prescription brought to the problems of the Ottoman Empire by Young Turks, who were influenced by the positivist-materialist movements that prevailed in Continental Europe in the second half

the 19th century, was an adaptation of ideas and opinions borrowed from the said movements to the unique structure of the Empire. Young Turks, who defined their goal as 'to pull the state out of a difficult situation' felt the need to moderate the idealist views they had acquired in Europe prior to 1908 in view of the conditions they faced after the declaration of independence and, to act more flexibly with a pragmatic understanding. Young Turks blamed people for their disappointment, which they faced after they returned home following the Declaration of the Constitutional Monarchy and they were annoyed by people's indifference to their activities. Therefore, Young Turks sometimes harshly criticized people and assumed the responsibility of awakening them from 'the sleep of a hundred years.' Young Turks, who believed that the reason for the disconnection between the subjects of the Empire and the state, which could in no way be eliminated, was the secondary social classes' (ulema (Muslim theologians and scholars), the state's chief men and notables) use of their positions for personal gain, did not give these groups, which could actually ensure the integration of the state and nation, a chance on this matter (Tural, 2004: 131 - 135).

As was stated in the 1908 Congress, the CUP had two primary goals: "to save the motherland from its existing bad situation and to ensure people can live in human dignity. With its first goal, the CUP primarily aimed to change the regime and liberate the state from the supervision of European countries. Its second goal was to eliminate underdevelopedness via the idea of progress. These goals could only be achieved with the implementation of 1876 Kanun-ı Esasi (Constitution). However, contrary to common belief, there was no deep philosophy behind the Young Turks' 'thoughts of liberty and political rights.' According to Young Turks, the constitutional monarchy, which they believed to be the only remedy to resolve problems facing the nation, was not a goal in itself, but a tool and an indicator of modernization. As Şerif Mardin underlined too, a "liberty' theory was the indirect theory of all groups opposing the Sultan, while their thoughts were basically founded on a 'progress' theory. Except for Prince Sabahaddin's thoughts that might be deemed "liberalist" to a certain extent, Young Turks' ideas mainly focused on 'awakening the nation' due to the significant influence of the thoughts prevailing in Europe at that time arguing the need for 'mobilizing' the masses (Ahmad, 1996: 30; Akşin, 1971: 154; Zürcher, 2004: 262; Mardin, 1991: 99 - 100).

Young Turks, who were highly influenced by theoreticians of the positivist school like Le Bon, Comte, Buchner and Durkheim, defined life as a "tangible object.' Taking this definition as a starting point,

they reached the conclusion that all functions of life could be analyzed by scientific methods. Young Turks considered the reasons that led the Empire to collapse as 'diseases and they declared themselves 'social doctors', who could cure those diseases. According to Young Turks, the reason for the failure of reforms that were launched in the Tanzimat Reform Era was the exclusion of the people from this process. In this respect, they differed from the Young Ottomans. Partly due to their social origin, Young Turks deemed the citizens' participation in the reform process essential. Young Turks, who considered the integration of the people to the said transformation process a prerequisite for the achievement of the idea of progress, did not assign a passive, but an active role to the people. This understanding, which bore the traces of elitist thought that were influential in Europe at that time, maintained that there was a direct relationship between the future of the state and the welfare of subjects of the Empire (Hanioğlu, 1985a: 604; Tural, 2004: 132 - 133).

Gustave Le Bon, one of the thinkers who influenced Young Turks, described the people as a mass that could never be trusted and argued that the ideal state should be governed by an elite class. In Le Bon's view, the sole reason for the backwardness of the East was the non-existence of an elite class. The creation of such an elite class could only be ensured by education, thus bringing the importance of 'being diplomaed" to the forefront. Young Turks believed that as equipped and educated individuals they should be a part of the administration instead of being in exile. One of the reasons they found to explain this contradictory situation was people's ignorance. The other reason was a social hierarchy strictly founded on a dual structure as 'masses' and 'elites'. Young Turks, who were influenced by Durkheim's theory of 'the division of labor', believed that a very well educated elite group could guide society and could achieve social transformation more easily. According to Durkheim's theory of 'the division of labor' "; important duties should be fulfilled solely by educated individuals, the most elite group of society. Therefore, Young Turks aimed to change the existing hierarchic structure and to place "educated elites" on the top of the pyramid shaped social structure. This approach that developed the thought that people, who were too miserable to be able to pursue their own self-interest, should be guided, granted Young Turks the right to govern and guide society (Tural, 2004: 133-136).

In short, Young Turk ideologists, heavily influenced by French positivism, believed that an intellectual elite's role in transforming society was crucial. The Unionists' devotion to positivism, who also

belonged to the administrative class, made them see themselves as 'intellectual elites who have assumed the mission of educating people', even though anti-democratic behavior, the underlying thought of positivism, conflicted with their constitutional monarchist status, Hence, administrative elites of the Committee of Union and Progress considered the education and training processes of the Second Constitutional Monarchy Era, during which they proposed "a new type of individual and society ', 'an ideological social engineering instrument'. The Unionists favored a society that progressed via regular reforms and solidarity in order to raise the social level. For this purpose, they gave the leading role to science and education.

THE IDEAL OF 'OTTOMANISM' AND EDUCATION (1908 - 1913)

The nationalism that weakened the multi-national Ottoman Empire throughout the 19th century, continued to spread among different nations of the Empire in the early 20th century. Now the CUP was faced with the vital problem of finding an answer to the question of how the Ottoman Empire would be held together and how its break up would be prevented against discriminatory nationalism coupled with the pressure of the great powers. The question, 'how can this state be saved?' was the basic phenomenon that determined the Unionists' standpoint (like all other Ottoman intellectuals), who voiced the longings of the new social class created by the reforms effected in the last quarter of the 19th century (Zürcher, 1996: 123; Akşin, 1998: 41; Ahmad, 1996: 10).

The Unionists believed that they would please the nations tending to disintegrate from the Empire, thus preventing the disintegration of the Empire by spreading liberty and justice countrywide. They struggled to embed the idea of 'constitutional citizenship' in line with the philosophy of 'Ottomanism' that stated all subjects are equal before the law irrespective of race, language and religion. In their view, central government that would ensure the integrity of the Ottomans should be powerful enough to ensure the amalgamation of different elements through economic development and education (Ahmad, 1986: 196; Mardin, 1983: 219 - 220; Berkes, 2002: 407).

According to the Unionists, who were also educated in modern schools founded in the second half of the 19th century inspired by the European examples, young generations, who could save the future of the Empire, could only be educated in modern schools. They, like the Ottoman administrative cadres, who contemplated the future of the Empire in the Tanzimat and Abdülhamit II periods, believed that in-

vesting in modern education could be the formula to save the future of the Ottoman Empire.[2]

The Committee of Union and Progress's political program, which was approved in 1908, stated, "All subjects shall be free to conduct educational activities. As stipulated in Kanun-ı Esasi, every Ottoman shall have the right to open a private school provided that the laws and regulations are observed" (Article 16). "All schools shall be subject to the supervision of the State. Ottoman subjects shall be educated in both public and private schools. Public schools shall be opened for all elements of the Empire. Education shall be provided in Turkish. Primary education shall be compulsory" (Article 17) (Tunaya, 1988a: 99).

Education was of utmost importance with respect to the future of the Ottoman Empire, because it would determine how future generations would be raised. The purpose of the Committee of Union and Progress was obvious. In the early Constitutional Era, the sole formula in the Unionists' mind for ensuring unity and progress was that education would serve the reinforcement of common Ottoman culture. The CUP that aimed for state-centered change intended to achieve its goal by enforcing laws that would stipulate the supervision of all schools throughout the Empire by the Ministry of Education. With the supervision of the Ministry of Education, anti-Ottomanist elements in the curriculums of non-public schools would be eliminated and compulsory Turkish courses would be included in the curriculums (Ahmad, 1986: 111; Akşin, 1998: 144).

The government wanted to include certain provisions pertaining to supervision in the Regulations on National Education that was intended to be enforced for the prevention of anti-Ottomanist education in non-Muslim and foreign schools. On the other hand, non-Muslims, on the grounds of sectarian privileges, wanted to impede any changes in the rights granted to them by Tanzimat, Reform Edict and Kanun-ı Esasi. Therefore, the enactment of Regulations on Education was continuously delayed due to such conflicts.

Despite the government's intent to supervise schools affiliated to the Patriarchate, the Patriarchate blamed the government for pursuing a Turkification policy and wanted to include the provision, '*the existing provisions pertaining to education shall remain the same*', in

[2] "…youngsters are the hope for our future… we say from the bottom of our heart that youngsters, the future of the country is in the hands of our children, who are now attending high schools and universities " (Hüseyin Cahit, "Gençler ve Mektepler", *Tanin,* 19 Şevval 1326/13 Teşrin-i Sani 1908)

the amendments to be made in the Kanun-ı Esasi. However, the Unionists opposed the inclusion of the said provision in the Constitution, arguing that this would mean granting political privileges to the Patriarchates. Tanin Newspaper, the voice of the Ittihatists, defended the government's attitude towards non-Muslim schools as follows (Hüseyin Cahit, "Mektepler Meselesi Nasıl Çıktı?", Tanin, 27 Cemaziyülevvel 1327/4 Haziran 1909):

> "Our goal is not to achieve unity in education. We have no intent to Turkify any of the elements. On the contrary, we will respect the language of every element. Education will be provided in the local language in primary schools of the state. In high schools, local languages will be optional. If the elements prefer a deeper use of their language in education, we will allow them to open private schools on condition that such schools shall be subject to state supervision. We will prevent providing anti-Ottomanist education in these schools. Shall we not object to the Patriarchates' aim to raise non-Muslim subjects as enemies of Turks as in the period of despotic administration?"

In the early days of the Second Constitutional Era, the Unionists tried to achieve the ideal of 'Ottomanism' by compromising with non-Muslims. Upon the failure of this approach, the Unionists endeavored to achieve their goal via the Assembly. Thus, in June 1909, they began to submit law proposals on the restriction of non-Muslims' political and cultural autonomy and the delegation of supervision of their mainly educational activities to the state. Thus, the state could achieve its aim of creating a common Ottoman culture in schools in the future. The Unionists wished to continue this process in a more comprehensive manner in such a way so as to include all subjects of the Empire. While preparing for early elections in 1912, the Unionists adopted a more compromising attitude towards non-Muslims. The same year, the Sublime Porte was also obliged to display a more moderate attitude towards non-Muslims because of the war with Italy. Following the disasters of Tripoli and the Balkan Wars, the Unionists began to adopt a more flexible attitude with respect to administrative centralism as they believed that it would only be possible to keep the rest of the Empire through radical reforms and decentralist policies. Along with cultural autonomy, the permission granted to Arab provinces to open schools that would offer education in their own language in 1913 was the manifestation of this approach (Ahmad, 1986: 99, 106 – 117; For more detailed information about the compromise between the Unionists and Arabs, see: Kayalı, 1998: 129 - 150).

The constitutional regime, which was re-established by Young Turks in July 1908 with an aim to save the Ottoman Empire from the disintegration process it was undergoing, faced numerous crises in a very short period of time. Among these crises were Bulgaria's announcement of independence, Bosnia-Herzegovina's official annexation by the Austria-Hungary Empire and Crete's amalgamation with Greece. Moreover, the Ottoman Empire lost Tripoli to Italy. The picture that emerged following the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913 showed that the Ottomanist policy failed to prevent other elements' nationalist movements and thus the Empire's disintegration process could not be avoided. The inclination of the Turkish people towards nationalism in a more apparent manner was the hardest knock, which the Ottomanist policy had taken. Now, the solution for salvation of the Empire started to be sought not in 'the unity of elements', but by strengthening the Turkish element.

THE UNIONISTS' INCLINATION TOWARDS TURKISH ELEMENT, EDUCATION AND SOCIAL ENGINERING

Even though it would be wrong to say that Turkish nationalism completed its evolution in the said period, during which the majority of nations within the Ottoman Empire (Greeks, Bulgarians, Armenians, even Albanians and Arabs) entered a nationalist process, there existed a secret Turkish identity awareness. The restlessness in Ottoman society caused by Europe's imperialist attitude began to generate a nationalist reaction towards the end of the 19th century. Pan-Islamism, which was having its heyday at the turn of the century, became an important step for Ottoman intellectuals in the transition from religious faith to national loyalty due to its inherited anti-imperialist opposition. The reason was that at the end of the 19th century, Pan-Islamism had an impact on the Turkish elites and intellectuals that could be defined as some sort of 'Proto-Nationalism'.[3] At the end of the 19th century, Turkish identity awareness strengthened as a result of a small group of Ottoman publishers, writers and intellectuals' growing interest in the Turkish language and history with the influence of Turkology studies conducted in Europe. In the last quarter of the 19th century, Proto-Nationalism that can be called 'Turkism' emerged with the influence of' Turkish intellectuals, who came from Russia, and literary movements investigating Turkish culture that

[3] For detailed information about the influence of Pan-Islamism on Ottoman intellectuals, which can be defined as 'Proto-Nationalism', see:. Nikki R. Keddie, "Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism", *The Journal of Modern History,* Vol. 41, No. 1, March 1969, pp. 17 – 28.

started to blossom in the Ottomans. The Young Turk philosophy underwent a similar development and the CUP developed an awareness of 'nationalism' from 1906 onwards (Georgeon, 2006: 23 - 27; Keddie, 1969: 18; Hanioğlu, 1985a: 626 - 649; for detailed information about Turkish Proto-Nationalism, see: Kushner, 1979).

Although the Ottomanism policy prevented Turkish people from inclining towards their nationality for a long time, the idea of focusing on the Turk element in the existing structure of the Ottoman Empire preserving the current structure was brought onto the agenda. Nevertheless, upon the objection of the Christian (Greeks and Armenians) and the Muslim (Albanians and Arabs) elements to this idea, the CUP, which officially adopted an Ottomanist policy after 1908, acknowledged themselves to be the representative of Turks in the course of time. Realizing that non-Muslims and non-Turks were those, who benefited most from the atmosphere of the environment, the CUP decided to assume a role on behalf of Turkish people similar to the role played by the religious institutions of non-Muslims for nations within the Ottoman Empire. From now on, the CUP, whose primary aim was to save the Turks from the centuries of underdevelopedness, would struggle to improve the competitiveness of Turks in the field of administrative and educational positions that were opened to non-Muslims in accordance with the principle of equality and, to ensure that Turks could also be employed in sectors other than state and agriculture sectors. The CUP's aim was to bring the Turk element, who had fallen well behind non-Muslims in respect of education and economic welfare, to the same level. Following the losses in the boundaries and the demographic structure of the Empire, the Unionists developed the idea of 'having a state that belonged to Muslim Turks'. They believed that after Tripoli and the Balkan Wars that ended with the loss of soil in Europe and Africa, the survival of the Empire could only be ensured by the modernization and mobilization of the Turk element. Thus they reinforced the idea of being the 'focus of solidarity' for Turks and struggled towards this goal with increased effort (Hanioğlu, 1985c: 1391; Akşin, 1971: 177 - 178; Georgeon, 2006: 26).

The Unionists tried to mobilize the Muslim Turk element via channelizing the defensive nationalist feelings that emerged in the Muslim Turk element as an outcome of the Empire's continuous loss of territories in the last two centuries to the idea, 'The Homeland is in

danger'.[4] The Unionists especially took advantage of the depression and war times and brought political effectiveness to the Committee thanks to the crowds and big meetings addressed by popular personalities like Committee member Hüseyin Cahit, the philosopher nicknamed Rıza Tevfik and Halide Edip. The Unionists used rural crowds for the first time against Bosnia-Herzegovina's annexation by the Austria-Hungary Empire and Crete's amalgamation with Greece. They turned the Turks' reaction towards the territorial losses incurred in the Balkan wars to account with their goals and, considered this reaction as a material, which they could shape throughout the war years[5] (Doğan, 1994: 75; Akşin, 1971: 166; Ahmad, 1999: 239 - 248).

The Unionists, after personally observing the educational competition among different nations of the Empire in the cosmopolitan structure of Salonika in the second half of the 19th century, realized the importance of education in the development of the nations that left the Empire. They became aware of the significance of making efficient use of education in mobilizing the Muslim Turk element. Therefore they attributed great importance to education and also trusted in its power in spreading the truth and improving people[6] (Üstel, 2004a: 29; Zürcher, 1996: 193).

> 'Schools are the prerequisites for our civilization. Schools are the sole instrument for assuring a nation's prosperity and future. The most important task of school is to raise young, active, untiring human brains filled with scientific knowledge for the future of the country. Today, we, too, desire to progress and develop, and to reinforce our international success and to preserve peace and pacifism. We should strive to increase the number of schools and to assure that children of this country benefit

---

[4] The heading of the first brochure published by the Ottoman Committee of Union and Progress in 1895 was 'The Homeland is in Danger'. Following the declaration of the Constitutional Monarchy, the Unionists issued a number of brochures under the heading 'The Homeland is in Danger'. For the content of the said brochures, see: Sözü (Ali Birinci, "İttihat ve Terakki'nin İlk Risalesi: Vatan Tehlikede", *Tarih ve Toplum*, Haziran 1988, Sayı: 54, s. 9–14).

[5] 'Navy Donations' to buy naval ships for the army, campaigns 'Winter Aid' campaigns for soldiers, the activities of the Red Crescent Association and National Defense were among efforts towards establishing soludarity among Turkish people. Forced migration of the Muslim Turk population to Anatolia since the Russo-Ottoman War of 1877–1878 and then the destruction caused by the Tripoli and Balkan Wars and World War I necessitated the activities of these social organizations, thus engaging people in such activities.

[6] Just after the 1908 Revolution,, Ahmet Rıza Bey ve Dr. Nazım Bey met with the French Minister of Education in Paris and asked him to send a delegation comprising of teachers required for the improvement of Ottoman educational institutions (Hüseyin Cahit, "Maarif Islahatı", *Tanin*, 21 Şaban 1326/17 Eylül 1908).

from these institutions in its fullest sense' (Halid Tevfik, "İhtiyacat-ı Medeniyemizin En Mühimlerinden: Mektepler", İttihat, 28 Mart 1910).

Low proportion of schooling in the Muslim Turkish society, of which the Unionists regarded themselves as its representative, created a sense of belatedness in the Unionists. The Unionists, who wanted to improve the cultural level of the Muslim Turk element, concentrated on opening private schools in the early years of the Constitutional Monarchy. With an aim to improve the special education of the Muslim Turk element and to save Turkish children form foreign private schools, they attempted to establish a joint venture under the pioneership of the Committee in 1909 and they established an association called 'The Ottoman Union Schools' the same year. The Committee named all the Committee-mandated schools 'Union and Progress Schools' and managed to run them without any financial support from the Ministry of Education. The curriculum of these schools was drawn up in the head-office of the Committee and their expenditures were covered by a tax called 'school uniform donation" to be collected from Committee members. With this decision, primary and secondary schools were opened in big provinces such as Istanbul, Bursa, Edirne and Izmir. Moreover, a private teacher training school was opened in Salonika to train teachers for existing schools or schools to be opened in the future. In the second year of the Constitutional Monarchy, the number of schools administered and financed by the CUP reached 600 including evening courses offered in the clubs (Koçer, 1991: 208; Yücel, 1994: 16; Muhiddin, "Mektepler", *Tanin,* 11 Cemaziyelahir 1328/18 Haziran 1910).[7]

The CUP, which struggled to open and administer schools independent from the Ministry of Education during the period in which it could not assume full political power, thus exercising external supervision over the government, concentrated on evening courses for children, who were not able to attend school and conferences for people from low social classes in view of their low literacy rate. Rather than leaving Turkish people, who somehow remained uneducated, to their fate, the Unionists endeavored to awaken feelings of connection and unity in these '*miserable people*' by holding conferences and offering evening courses in a popularized manner. Evening courses that had a curriculum involving the knowledge of an average primary school graduate were offered with the aim of enlightening

[7] The names given to private schools opened by the CUP - "Menba-yı Füyüzat, Dârü'l-İrfân, Bedraka-yı İrfan, Hadika-i Maarif, Dârü'l-Edeb, Bürhânü'l-Maarif, Darü't-Tedris, Ravza-i İrfan, Hadika-i Vatan – clearly reveal the mission attributed to education and science by the Unionists as instruments of progress and development.

people. Participants were told that '*the interest of the nation and country was unquestionably superior to personal interest* and that industry, agriculture and trade should be collectively developed. Besides, evening courses aimed to arouse a love of the country (Ahenk, 10 Teşrin-i Evvel 1909).[8]

The Committee of Union and Progress, which considered itself an organization responsible for educating, enlightening and guiding society, aspired to serve as a development association via its branches throughout the Empire. Article 13 of the Committee Regulation of 1911 said (Tunaya, 1988a: 117):

> 'In respect of its organizational status, the Committee of Union and Progress is an entrepreneurship movement. The duties of this organization is to offer evening courses for adults; to establish schools for future generations; to publish newspapers and useful books; to incentivize agriculture, industry and trade; to assist the poor; and to make an effort to render the Ottoman nation, which is noble, fair and affectionate by nature, economically active and intellectually free'.

The Unionists understood that focusing on the Muslim Turk element was the only solution to save the Empire. So, they began to pursue a policy that would primarily observe the interests of the Muslim Turkish population with an aim to form a powerful state around this element. The Committee of Union and Progress, whose goals had begun to overlap with those of the ethnic nationalist movement, which was organized by the educated elites both in the Empire and abroad in this period, did not overlook the phenomenon of progressively strengthening Turkism. In 1911, the journal 'Young Writers' that was published in Salonika was involved in a similar movement on the one hand and the Society of Turkish Homeland was established on 31 August on the other hand. After a short while, *the Society of Turkish Homeland* merged with a newly founded organization called *Turkish Hearth*. The same group started to publish an inclusive journal, Turkish Homeland, as the voice of Turks. The Committee of Union and Progress became highly influential on the activities of Turkish Association, which had an ideational influence on the youth, especially through Turkist writers, who came from Salonika (Ziya Gökalp and his friends, writers of 'Young Writers') (Hanioğlu, 1985d: 1397; Ülken, 1979: 212; Akşin, 1998: 177 - 178; Üstel, 2004a: 69 - 80 For more

[8] Evening courses included the Ottoman, Persian and Arabic alphabet, Elifba, Koran, Hadis-i Şerif, Introduction to Religion, Reading, Grammar, Mathematics, Ottoman Turkish Grammar, Ottoman Turkish Composition, Writing, History of Civilization Social Sciences and Ethics, Bookkeeping, Ottoman History and Geography (*Ahenk,* 2 Teşrin-i Sani 1910).

information about the activities of the Turkish Association, Young Writers, Turkish Homeland and *Turkish Hearth* and their relations with the CUP, see: Arai, 1994)

After 1910, as explicitly stated in Turkist circles, the Unionists also supported the idea of the necessity of a radical social revolution towards nationalist goals rather than a revolution limited to the state apparatus (Kieser, 2008: 44; Akşin, 1998: 111 - 112). Among those who voiced the need for a social revolution was Satı Bey, one of the prominent educators of that period, who was commissioned to improve İstanbul Darülmuallimin Mektebi (İstanbul Teacher Training School) in the early Second Constitutional Monarchy Era.

According to Satı Bey, the 1908 and 1909 revolutions were of a political nature. Now, it was time for a moral, intellectual and social revolution in a general sense. Such a revolution could only be achieved by '*the army of teachers',* who always played an important role in the development of nations. Undoubtedly, this was a very difficult task. However, teachers should raise children as *'hardworking, determined and intellectual Ottomans with national pride*' with determination, fortitude, enthusiasm and sacrifice, because teachers were the sole hope of the motherland (Satı, 1326: 185 - 195).[9]

However, the current situation of education and the qualifications of teachers that would save the future of the Ottomans lacked the structure that could achieve the said goal.[10] Therefore, at the beginning of the Constitutional Monarchy Era, improvement of institutions that conducted the education of the Muslim Turk element came onto the agenda and the starting point of reform in the field of education became an important subject of debate. According to Darülmuallimin Principal Satı Bey, the role of primary schools in social change would be more significant as their number was more than secondary and high schools and they left deeper traces in children's minds:

---

[9] Satı Bey, in his report titled 'About Teacher Training', which he submitted to the Minister of Education Emrullah Efendi in 1912, presented methods for developing qualified primary school teachers. For detailed information, see: (Satı, *Layihalarım*, İstanbul, 1327, ss. 62 – 104).

[10] Ahmet Şerif, who travelled through Anatolia as the correspondent of Tanin Newspaper and wrote his observations under the heading 'Tanin in Anatolia', described the situation of Muslim Turkish schools and teachers as 'miserable'. 'Our Anatolia correspondent wrote his impressions about every school he visited in every province and town he stopped at, From now on, our readers, who follow the articles, 'Tanin in Anatolia' will not be able to visualize anything but many children filled in a small, stinky room; an ignorant teacher and an irrational, aimless curriculum violating all procedures when country schools are mentioned" (Hüseyin Cahit, "Maarif İçin", *Tanin,* 26 Rebiyülevvel 1328/7 Nisan 1910).

> "The curricular content of primary education determines the prosperity and future of nations; the deepest transformations and the biggest revolutions in nations are achieved by nothing but primary education. Our, 'the Ottomans,' future will also be determined by the result of the improvement to be made in our schools; Future Ottomanism will be manufactured in today's schools. Schools are an idea and intelligence workshops" (Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası, Cilt 1, Sayı 1, 1326, s. 1 - 2).

Education Minister Emrullah Efendi, who had argued with his theory, "*The Tuba Tree Theory*" that reform should start with universities, changed his opinion in view of the current conditions of the Empire and gave priority to the enactment of the Law on Primary Education. Emrullah Efendi stated that education was not merely a financial issue and that though seventy thousand qualified teachers were needed to serve in country schools especially, they could not find even one-hundredth of this figure. Emrullah Efendi also maintained that in this context, primary education was of crucial importance. Underlining the lack of school buildings in villages, Emrullah Efendi maintained that even if schools could be built, there were not adequate financial resources needed for teachers' pay. Besides, he argued that though the reformation of primary education could not be effected by budget allocation, the issue of education could not be delayed just because of financial difficulties. According to Emrullah Efendi, the only solution to this problem was that buildings and expenses needed for primary education would be covered by the people (Osman Ergin, 1977: 1278; Uyanık, 2000: 6 - 13).

The gloomy picture of Ottoman finance was an important obstacle to education reform. The Unionists believed that education budget allocation was inadequate for the realization of reforms. Therefore, they constantly encouraged the Muslim Turk element to provide financial support to educational institutions.

The Unionists maintained that everything for education should not be expected from the state. They underlined the non-Muslims' sacrifices to improve their educational institutions and wanted the Muslim Turk element to play its part. For the purpose of collecting the money needed for educational improvement, provincial administrations held lotteries; cinema sessions were held in aid of schools or, 'donations' were collected from students through donation boxes in schools (Hüseyin Cahit, "Tedrisat Meselesi", *Tanin,* 9 Recep 1327/26 Temmuz 1909).

The Unionists, who saw educational underdevelopedness of the Muslim Turk element as an obstacle to social progress, thought that ignorance could only be overcome by spreading education to the

lower social class. Therefore, they focused on primary education reform, attempting to effect education reform, which had been realized in secondary and higher education by that time, from bottom to top. The Unionists aimed to improve and spread primary schools to rural areas as they attributed an important mission to teachers with pedagogical formation in order to ensure successful primary education reform. It was maintained in the resolution submitted by the Ministry of Education to Parliament during the discussions on the 1909 Budget of the Ministry that the reformation and spread of primary education were primarily dependent on the opening of training schools for teachers of primary education in certain provinces and sanjaks (districts) that would train teachers for the new education system. Hence, an additional 2 million kuruş was allocated for primary education teacher training schools (BOA. ŞD. TNZ. 448/39). Moreover, in 1910, Parliament enacted a law on eliminating teachers without pedagogical training. With this law, teachers and principals with 20-year term of service were pensioned off over a 30-year term (BOA. İ. Mec. Umumi. 25.C.1328, BOA. BEO. Gel- Gid. Def. Maarif. 283128).

Parents who refrained from sending their children to school despite the stipulation of primary education by the 1869 General Education Regulations stood as one of the major obstacles to the spread of modern Ottoman education. Parents' indifference to educational institutions continued to be one of main concerns of education administrators during the Second Constitutional Monarchy Era too. Education Minister Emrullah Efendi stated: as follows in the 'Explanatory Note' on the political program declared in the 4th Congress of the Committee of Union and Progress in 1912:

> "…Education is a prerequisite for ensuring a nation's prosperity and future and a country's welfare and happiness. Constitutional government has to admit that this is a fact. Despotic government and uneducated people mirror each other. They are twins. Constitutionalism and enlightenment cannot be separated from one another. The maturity of a nation is only possible by the education of a nation. Every progress is the sole reason for science and education. The fact that a nation's wealth, morality, welfare and recovery can only be ensured by education has been tried and tested."

Emrullah Efendi emphasized the public interest of this issue and brought the stipulation of primary education to the forefront. He also argued that parents should send their children to school (Emrullah Efendi, 1330: 80 - 83).

The traumatic impact of heavy defeat in the Balkans against former subjects of the Empire on the Ottoman public consciousness

urged Ottoman intellectuals to seek reasons for the success of the enemy and their failure. The success of the Balkan nations was linked to the superiority of their education systems and teachers rather than military factors. Moreover, the ascertainment of educational backwardness of the Turk element brought about the need for urgent and radical innovations in the field of education. The Balkan Wars popularized the following belief in society that materialized in Şevket Süreyya Aydemir's words, '*the existence of our state, which was defeated and has lost its charm, and our wounded nation will only be saved by primary school teachers'* (Akyüz, 2002: 55; Sakaoğlu, 1993: 137; Osman Ergin, 1977: 1338; Aydemir, 1979: 415).

The Ottoman public's criticisms that educational reforms were neglected because of the state's heavy defeat in the Balkan War in 1912 accelerated the preparation of the Law on Primary Education. Statutory Law on Primary Education 1913, which was put into effect in the first years of 1913, became a crucial breaking point in spreading education to the masses. With this Law that made primary education free and compulsory for every citizen, primary education, which comprised of primary schools and middle schools was restructured under one roof called 'General Primary Schools' and six-year schools were opened. The administration and financing of these schools were left to special provincial administrations established solely for this purpose (Koçer, 1991: 231; Üstel, 2004b: 37; Tekeli - İlkin, 1999: 86).

The Unionists, who saw education as the most effective instrument in achieving the desired society, carried out 'a pedagogical engineering' movement throughout the Constitutional Monarchy Era. After 1908, they made amendments in the curriculums within the framework of 'social engineering' concerns for future citizens and included the citizenship course under the name, "Introduction to Civilization and Law, Ethics and Economics' as an independent course. The textbooks for the Introduction to Civilization emphasized the characteristics of citizens, who would comprise the new society. Reading essays included in the said textbooks reflect 'behavior engineering' dominated by the concern to raise children as civilized individuals. Reading texts provided in History and Geography textbooks that were re-written after the Declaration of Second Constitutional conveyed messages that would contribute to the identity formation of citizens with the desired characteristics (Üstel, 2004b: 32, 33, 36, 37, 38, 39, 54; Toprak, 1988: 157).

The Unionists, aspired for a new Constitutional Monarchy generation starting with nursery schools and regarded children as the future of society. In this context, the Unionists, who discovered the im-

portance of children and thus, aimed to bring up generations equipped with citizenship awareness, focused publishing activities on publishing children magazines (For children magazines published in the Second Constitutional Monarchy Era, see: Okay, 1999a; Karakışla, 1988: 216 - 220).

Due to their important role in national development, the improvement of women's education was brought onto the agenda. The Unionists considered women to be the first teachers of children since they would give birth to future generations, and realized that children, who would be brought up by educated mothers assumed importance in forming the new society. Thus, women became the object of the Unionists' social engineering project. In 1913, primary education was made compulsory for girls and thanks to the educational opportunities offered by the administration, young girls began to benefit from a progressively increasing number of schools at different levels. With the men at war, society needed women to fill the employment gap, thus resulting in women's increased participation in daily life. Middle- and upper class urban women's status began to change due to the Ittidatists' policies, which began to encourage women to participate more in social life from the 1908 Revolution onwards, coupled with the impacts of World War I (Zürcher, 1996: 178; Berkes, 2002: 392; Koçer, 1991: 226 - 227). [11]

After the participation of the Ottoman Empire in World War I on the side of the Central Powers, the Unionists intensified collaboration with Germany for the purpose of modernization of the army and education on the basis of the German model. One development of the said collaboration that increased during World War I was youth organizations. The Unionists wanted to gain control of youngsters via paramilitary youth organizations that they established countrywide in order to prepare them for war (Ahmad, 1996: 56; for detailed information on the modernization of the Ottoman education on the basis of the German Model, see: Gencer, 2003).

The Turkish Power Association, established in 1913, ensured countrywide organization of scouting. The Turkish Power Associa-

[11] The Association for Improving Women's Status, which aimed to enhance women's participation in social life, was established in 1912, followed by The Association for Women's Employment affiliated to the Red Crescent Association, which encouraged urban women to work outside their home. In this period, there was a gradual increase in the number of woman magazines in line with the establishment of women-oriented associations, Magazines such as Woman's Garden (1912), Woman's World (1912), Woman's Life (1913) and Woman's Heart (1919) were issued by women and an attempt was made to increase women's participation in social life.

tion, which was highly supported by the Ministry of War and the Unionists, was replaced by Ottoman Power Associations established in 1914. Ottoman Power Associations were established on 28 May 1914 in order to 'prepare youths physically and psychologically for defense of the motherland *and to ensure that they maintain their strength'*. The primary aim of these Associations was to prepare youths for a war environment with real weapons and bullets under supervision of Ministry of War staff (Yağcıoğlu, 1992: 100; Tunaya, 1989: 297). However, the Committee of Union and Progress abolished Ottoman Power Associations in 1916, considering them inadequate in preparing youths for a war environment. On 17 April 1916, Ottoman Youth Associations were established in place of Ottoman Power Associations for the purpose of gathering much larger masses of youths for military organization and discipline. Starting in April 1916, all youths from all rural and urban areas, who were between 12 years of age and of draft age – whether they were students or not - were gathered into Robust Associations (12 - 17 years of age) and Youth Associations (above 17 years of age). Thus, Youth Associations founded by the Committee of Union and Progress acquired a nature beyond being paramilitary. The characteristic of this group, which was mobilized in the most chaotic year of the World War, was that it included unschooled rural youths too. In an environment, where merely one fifth of youths could attend school, Robust and Youth Associations spread so fast throughout the Ottoman Empire that the number of country-wide Youth Associations reached 706 within a year (July 1917) (Ahenk, 1334; Tunaya, 1989: 298 - 299; Balcıoğlu, 1992: 98 - 102).

Though wartime conditions made it easy for the Unionists to take control of the youths, it also caused a big problem of sheltering more than 15 thousand children, who lost their parents to war. Orphanages, which were opened in 1916 to take these children into protection by the state, were gathered under the roof of the General Directorate of Orphanages affiliated to the Ministry of Education. In the Orphanages, children were not only taught reading, but also art. However, after the Orphanages were closed due to certain inadequacies, another solution was sought for the problem of orphans and finally, The Association for Sheltering Orphans was founded in 1917. (For information about the effects of wars on children in the Constitutional Monarchy Era, see: Okay, 1999c: 489 - 495; Okay, 2007: 219 - 232. For information on sheltering orphans, see: Okay, 1999b).

The decisions made in the 7th Congress of the Committee of Union and Progress held on 28 September 1916, which could not gather in 1914 and 1915 because of war assumed importance with respect to

education. In view of a proposal submitted by Ziya Gökalp, the Union and Progress Government effected a series of reforms in 1916 in order to ensure the monopolistic administration of education, which was subject to power duality for a long time. As an example, Shaikh al-lslam (the chief religious official in the Ottoman Empire) was excluded from the Cabinet. Sharia Courts serving under the Office of Shaikh al-lslam were affiliated to the Ministry of Justice. Madrasahs were affiliated to the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Waqfs was established for Waqfs. These reforms that reflected the Union and Progress Government's effort towards secularization, which mingled centralization and state administration, incorporated characteristics that laid the ground for the secular practices and education and training unity adopted after the declaration of the Republic (Berkes, 2002: 459; Yağcıoğlu, 1992: 102; Mantran, 1995: 289).

CONCLUSION

The administrative cadres of the Committee of Union and Progress claimed that they would prevent the collapse of the Ottoman Empire by spreading liberty and justice countrywide through the constitutional monarchy government, which they formed in 1908. The loss of Ottoman soil in Africa and Europe in a very short period of time proved that the Ottomanist policies adopted had failed to stop the Empire's disintegration process. The Unionists, who believed that strengthening of the Muslim Turk element was the key to salvation of the Empire, regarded education as the sole instrument to improve the situation of the Muslim Turk element that socioeconomically fell behind other elements of the Empire. Thus, they aimed to catch up with the other elements of the Ottoman Empire. In the early years of the Constitutional Monarchy Era, during which they were unable to gain political power, they attempted to raise the cultural level of the Muslim Turk element by opening private schools; offering evening courses and holding conferences via associations they established for this purpose.

Concerned that at least three generations would be utilized until achieving the desired level of education reform, the Unionists, after gaining political power, tried to spread education to large masses of people via primary education reform. For the purpose of attaining their 'dream society', they focused on the nationalization of education; education and training unity; reformation of Arab Alphabet in order to obtain a simpler alphabet; language simplification and the spread of education among women in order to ensure their further participation in social life.

The Unionists, who saw themselves as social engineers responsible for guiding society, did not consider formal education adequate while attempting to transform society. Considering that education institutions alone would not be adequate in spreading new knowledge and views to large masses of people, they tried to offer education that could be regarded as the 'people's education' movement for the first time in the history of the Ottoman Empire. The Unionists struggled to educate the population above the school age by publishing newspapers and magazines; offering evening courses and holding conferences and succeeded in creating a channel as effective as education.

As it is seen, education was the field in which the Unionists succeeded at most. Yet three generations of educated people, including high school students, the intellectual capital of the nation, were lost during the Balkan Wars, World War I and the Independence War. The Unionists' political power in the Ottoman Empire came to an end after being accused as the sole cause of the Ottoman Empire's defeat in World War I. Thus, along with reforms such as language simplification, unity in education/training and the adoption of the Latin alphabet, the mission of creating 'a national state' by transforming the existing society into a secular and modern society was inherited by the Republican administrative cadres from the Committee of Union and Progress.

REFERENCES

Ahenk, 10 Teşrin-i Evvel 1909.

Ahenk, 2 Teşrin-i Sani 1910.

Ahmad, F. (1986), *İttihat ve Terakki (1908 - 1914)*, İstanbul, Kaynak Yayınları.

Ahmad, F. (1996), *İttihatçılıktan Kemalizme*, İstanbul, Kaynak Yayınları.

Ahmad, F. (1999), "Jön Türkler Döneminde Savaş ve Toplum 1908 - 1918", (Trans. Sevda Akyüz), *Tarih ve Toplum*, Sayı 64, s. 239 - 248.

Akşin, S. (1971), "İttihat ve Terakki Üzerine", *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi,* Cilt 26, Sayı 1, s.153 - 182.

Akşin, S. (1998), *Jön Türkler ve İttihat ve Terakki,* Ankara: İmge Yayınevi.

Akyüz, Y. (2002), "Eğitim Alanında Aydınların Özeleştirisi ve Balkan Savaşları*", Tarih ve Toplum,* Sayı 228, Cilt 38, s. 54-58.

Alkan, M. Ö. (2000),"Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Eğitim ve Eğitim İstatistikleri, 1839 - 1924", Halil İnalcık - Şevket Pamuk (Eds.), *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Bilgi ve İstatistik,* Ankara: T.C Başbakanlık Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Yayınları.

Alkan, M. Ö. (2001), "Resmi İdeolojinin Doğuşu ve Evrimi Üzerine Bir Deneme", Mehmet Ö. Alkan (Ed.), *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce:*

Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası-Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi, Cilt 1, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, s. 377 - 407.

Alkan, M. Ö. (2004), "İmparatorluk'tan Cumhuriyet'e Modernleşme ve Ulusçuluk Sürecinde Eğitim", Kemal H. Karpat (Ed.), *Osmanlı Geçmişi ve Bugünün Türkiye'si*, (Trans. Sönmez Taner), İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, s. 73 - 242.

Arai, M. (1994), *Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği*, (Trans. Tansel Demirel), İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Aydemir, Ş. S. (1979), *Suyu Arayan Adam*, İstanbul, Remzi Kitabevi.

Balcıoğlu, M. (1992), "Osmanlı Genç Dernekleri", *Türk Kültürü*, Şubat, Sayı 346, s. 98 - 102.

Berkes, N. (2002), *Türkiye'de Çağdaşlaşma,* (Haz. Ahmet Kuyaş), İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Birinci, A. (1988), "İttihat ve Terakki'nin İlk Risalesi: Vatan Tehlikede", *Tarih ve Toplum*, Sayı 54, s. 9 - 14.

BOA. İ. Mec. Umumi. 25. C. 1328.

BOA. BEO. Gel- Gid. Def. Maarif. 283128.

BOA. ŞD. TNZ.448/39.

Bumin, K. (1983), *Batı'da Eğitim ve Çocuk*, İstanbul, Alan Yayıncılık.

Doğan, Nuri (1994), *Ders Kitapları ve Sosyalleşme (1876 - 1918),* İstanbul, Bağlam Yayıncılık.

Düstur, İkinci Tertip, Cilt 6.

Emrullah Efendi, (1330), *Osmanlı İttihad ve Terakki Fırkasının 1327 Senesi 4. Kongresinde Tanzim Olunan Siyasi Programa Dair İzahnâme*, Konstantiniye: Matbaa-i Hayriye.

Fortna, B. C. (2005), *Mekteb-i Hümayûn: Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nun Son Döneminde İslâm, Devlet ve Eğitim*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Gencer, M. (2003), *Jön Türk Modernizmi ve "Alman Ruhu", 1908 - 1918 Dönemi Türk-Alman İlişkileri ve Eğitim*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

"Genç Dernekleri Talimatnamesi", *Ahenk,* 14 Nisan 1332/21 Cemaziyelahir 1334.

Georgeon, F. (2006), "Osmanlı Devletinde Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Yükselişi (1908 - 1914)" *Osmanlı - Türk Modernleşmesi (1900 – 1930) Seçilmiş Makaleler*, (Trans. Ali Berktay), İstanbul, Yapı Kredi Yayınları, s. 23- 38.

Halid Tevfik, "İhtiyacat-ı Medeniyemizin En Mühimlerinden: Mektepler", *İttihat,* 28 Mart 1910.

Hanioğlu, M. Ş. (1985a), *Bir Siyasal Örgüt Olarak Osmanlı İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti ve Jön Türklük (1889 - 1902),* Cilt 1, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Hanioğlu, Ş. (1985b), "Batıcılık", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Cilt 5, İletişim Yayınları, s. 1382 - 1388.

Hanioğlu, Ş. (1985c), "Osmanlıcılık", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Cilt 5, İletişim Yayınları, s. 1389 - 1393.

Hanioğlu, Ş. (1985d), "Türkçülük", *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi*, Cilt 5, İletişim Yayınları, s. 1394 - 1399.

Hüseyin Cahit, "Maarif Islahatı", *Tanin*, 21 Şaban 1326/17 Eylül 1908.

Hüseyin Cahit, "Gençler ve Mektepler", *Tanin,* 19 Şevval 1326/13 Teşrin-i Sani 1908.

Hüseyin Cahit, "Mektepler Meselesi Nasıl Çıktı?", *Tanin,* 27 Cemaziyülevvel 1327/4 Haziran 1909.

Hüseyin Cahit, "Tedrisat Meselesi", *Tanin,* 9 Recep 1327/26 Temmuz 1909.

Hüseyin Cahit, "Maarif İçin", *Tanin,* 26 Rebiyülevvel 1328/7 Nisan 1910.

Karaca, A. (1993), *Anadolu Islahâtı ve Ahmet Şâkir Paşa (1838 - 1899)*, İstanbul, Eren Yayıncılık.

Karakışla, Y. S. (1988), "II. Meşrutiyet'te Bir Çocuk Dergisi: Çocuk Dünyası", *Tarih ve Toplum*, Cilt 9, No: 52, s. 216 - 220.

Kayalı, H. (1998), *Jön Türkler ve Araplar (1908 - 1918)*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Keddie, N. R. (1969), "Pan-Islam as Proto-Nationalism", *The Journal of Modern History,* March, Vol. 41, No. 1, p. 17 -28.

Kieser, H. L. (2005), *Iskalanmış Barış, Doğu Vilayetleri'nde Misyonerlik, Etnik Kimlik ve Devlet 1839 - 1938*, (Trans. Atilla Dirim), İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Kieser, H. L. (2008), *Türklüğe İhtida, 1870 - 1939 İsviçre'sinde Yeni Türkiye'nin Öncüleri,* (Trans. Atilla Dirim), İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Koçer, H. A. (1991), *Türkiye'de Modern Eğitimin Doğuşu ve Gelişimi (1773-1923),* İstanbul, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Kushner, D. (1979), *Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu (1876 - 1908),* (Trans. Şevket Serdar Türet - Rekin Ertem - Fahri Erdem), İstanbul, Kervan Yayınları.

Mantran, R. (1995), *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi II*, (Trans. Server Tanilli), İstanbul, Adam Yayınları.

Mardin, Ş. (1983), *Jön Türklerin Siyasi Fikirleri 1895 - 1908*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Mardin, Ş. (1991), *Türk Modernleşmesi Makaleler 4*, Mümtaz'er Türköne - Tuncay Önder (Eds.), İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Muhiddin, "Mektepler", *Tanin,* 11 Cemaziyelahir 1328/18 Haziran 1910.

Okay, C. (1999a), *Eski Harfli Çocuk Dergileri*, İstanbul, Kitapevi Yayınları.

Okay, C. (1999b), *Belgelerle Himaye-i Etfal Cemiyeti 1917-1923*, İstanbul, Şule Yayınları.

Okay, C. (1999c), "Meşrutiyet Dönemi'nde Savaş ve Çocuk", *Osmanlı,* Cilt 5, s. 489 - 495.

Okay, C. (2007), "War and Child in the Second Constitutional Period", *Enfance et Jeunesse dans le Monde Musulman,* ESP Maisonneuve& Larose, p. 219 - 232.

Osman Ergin, (1977), *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, Cilt 3 - 4, İstanbul, Eser Matbaası.

Satı, *Layihalarım*, İstanbul, 1327.

Satı, *Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası*, 15 Temmuz 1326, No. 6, Cilt 1, s. 185 - 195.

Sakaoğlu, N. (1993), *Osmanlı Eğitim Tarihi*, İstanbul.

Somel, S. A. (2001), "Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlıcılık Düşüncesi (1839 - 1913)", *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce: Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası-Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi*, Mehmet Ö. Aklan (Ed.), Cilt 1, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları, s. 88 - 116.

Szyliowicz, J. S. (2000), "Osmanlı'nın Eğitsel Mirası: Efsane mi, Yoksa Gerçek mi?", L. Carl Brown (Ed.), *İmparatorluk Mirası*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Tedrisat-ı İbtidaiye Mecmuası, Cilt 1, Sayı 1, 1326 s. 1 - 2.

Tekeli, İ. - İlkin, S. (1999), *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Eğitim ve Bilgi Üretim Sisteminin Oluşumu ve Dönüşümü*, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Temir, A. (1987), *Yusuf Akçura*, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Toprak, Z. (1982), *Milli İktisat ve Milli Burjuvazi (1908 - 1918)*, Ankara: Yurt Yayınları.

Toprak, Z. (1988), "80. Yıldönümünde 'Hürriyetin İlanı' (1908) ve 'Rehber-i İttihad'", *Toplum ve Bilim*, Sayı 42, s. 157 - 173.

Tunaya, T. Z. (1988), *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler*, Cilt 1, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Tunaya, T. Z. (1989), *Türkiye'de Siyasal Partiler*, Cilt 3, İstanbul, Hürriyet Vakfı Yayınları.

Tural, E. (2004), "Devlet ve Toplum Ekseninde Jön Türklük ve Bir Jön Türk'ün Düşün(dür)dükleri", *Amme İdaresi Dergisi,* Mart 2004*,* Cilt 31, Sayı 1, s. 131 - 147.

Uyanık, E. (2000), *II. Meşrutiyet Döneminde İttihat ve Terakki'nin Eğitim Politikası ve İzmir,* Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), İzmir.

Ülken, H. Z. (1979), *Türkiye'de Çağdaş Düşünce Tarihi*, İstanbul, Ülken Yayınları.

Üstel, F. (2004a), *İmparatorluktan Ulus-Devlete Türk Milliyetçiliği: Türk Ocakları 1912-1931,* İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Üstel, F. (2004b), *Makbul Vatandaşın Peşinde: II. Meşrutiyet'ten Bugüne Vatandaşlık Eğitimi*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Yağcıoğlu, E. (1992), *İttihat ve Terakki'nin Son Yılları (1916 Kongre Zabıtları)*, İstanbul, Nehir Yayınları.

Yücel, H. A. (1994), *Türkiye'de Orta Öğretim*, Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.

Zürcher, E. J. (1996), *Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi*, İstanbul, İletişim Yayınları.

Zürcher, E. J. (2004), "Jön Türkler, Müslüman Osmanlılar ve Türk Milliyetçileri: Kimlik Politikaları 1908 - 1938", Kemal H. Karpat (Ed.),*Osmanlı Geçmişi ve Bugünün Türkiye'si*, (Trans. Sönmez Taner), İstanbul, İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, s. 261 - 292.