



Decision Making
And Change In The
Ottoman
Empire
Caesar E. Farah, Editor

The Thomas Jefferson University Press
At Northeast Missouri State University

1993

Chapter 18

Muslim Education in the Vilayet of Beirut, 1880-1918

Martin Strohmeier

THE MOST SIGNIFICANT IMPULSES for new developments in Muslim education in Lebanon¹ can be traced back to the early 1880s and are lined with the names of outstanding representatives of the Islamic reform movement. In 1880 Shaykh Husayn al-Jisr (1845-1909) founded *al-Madrasa al-waṭāniya* (the national school) in Tripoli. His aim was to provide an Islamic and “national” educational alternative to foreign schools by combining religious and secular subjects in the curriculum.² Rashīd Riḍa (1865-1935) studied religious subjects, logic, and natural sciences in this school after attending the local *mekteb-i rüşdi*. The courses were taught in Arabic, with Turkish and French offered as foreign languages. The Madrasa waṭāniya was closed down when the authorities refused to recognize its status as a religious school, thereby depriving its pupils of military exemption. Thus Tripolis lost a promising educational institution through the “stupidity and ignorance” of the government.³

Riḍa continued his education at another school in Tripoli. Al-Jisr assumed a position at the *Madrasa sultāniya* in Beirut. This school was directed by Shaykh Aḥmad ‘Abbās al-Azhari (1853-1927)⁴ and run by the Islamic society for benevolent purposes (*jam‘iyat al-maqāsid al khayriya al-islāmīya*, abbreviated: *Maqāsid*).⁵ Here al-Jisr met Muḥammad ‘Abduh who had recently arrived in his chosen exile after having being deported from Egypt which had been under British occupation since 1882.

At the same time, the *Maqāsid* were dissolved and eventually incorporated into the Council of Education (*Maarif meclisi*), which was the highest provincial body in educational affairs. The *Mekteb-i sultani*, the upper level of the Ottoman secondary school system, was subsequently reopened as a public institution. In this process al-Azhari lost his position probably as a result of plots instigated by the *Mekteb-i rüşdi-i askeri*.⁶ After sojourns in Paris and Tunis, ‘Abduh returned to Beirut at the beginning of 1885 and received a call to teach Arabic language and rhetoric at that same *Mekteb* where Shakīb Arslān and his younger brother Nasīb were his students.⁷

Deeply troubled by the predominance of local and foreign Christian educational institutions, 'Abduh wrote a memorandum entitled "Reflections on Reform and Religious Instruction," which he sent to the office of *Şeyhülislâm* in Istanbul in March of 1887.⁸ In this document he states that Muslims are ignorant of their faith and decadent. He continues:

This inner weakness has paved the way for foreign devils⁹ into the hearts of many Muslims and enabled them to win their affection. Muslims are rendered vulnerable to their intrigues and evil insinuations. Their preachers have captivated the minds of many Muslims. They have streamed to the Islamic countries, even to the Ottoman empire, in order to lead Muslims astray. We can scarcely find one place without a school of the Americans, Jesuits, Lazarists, Frères, or other European religious societies. Muslims do not shrink from sending their children to these schools. They desire that their children be instructed in the disciplines considered necessary for their livelihood and in European languages, which are seen as a prerequisite for future happiness. . . . As far as public (*al-makâtib*) and the traditional Islamic schools (*al-madâris al-Islâmîya*) are concerned, no or very little religious instruction takes place. Only ritual practices (*'ibādât*) are presented in a very abbreviated and formulaic manner which is restricted to memorizing certain sentences, the meanings of which are not understood. This is the reason that many of those who have attended military or other schools are no longer religious and are not acquainted with the principle of their faith. . . .¹⁰

'Abduh's warning seems to have gone unheeded on the long bureaucratic road to the *mahrûse*.¹¹ He felt obliged to address his second memorandum, entitled *al-lâ'iha al-thânîya fî iṣlâḥ al-quṭr al-sûri* (March 1888), to someone much closer, the *vali* of the recently established province Beirut.¹² He criticizes the Ottoman authorities for giving credence to Christian insinuations that the *Maqâsid* had pursued political goals¹³ and for closing the schools, thereby reinforcing Christian dominance of the educational system.¹⁴ 'Abduh argues that Muslim children who graduated from Christian schools were either "Christians in faith and Muslims in name only or atheists and materialists."¹⁵ After leaving school they went to work for foreign companies and consulates.¹⁶ But foreigners could only be beat at their own game, namely education. 'Abduh laments that an Ottoman school meeting the needs of the population had never been founded.¹⁷ To rectify this situation he proposes that a lycée (*maktab 'âli*) be set up in the form of a boarding school under the following conditions: The school director must have a command of Arabic and the language of instruction must be Arabic, thus relegating Turkish to minor importance. The leitmotif of the school would

be the "restoration of faith and love for one's country" (*ihyā' al-dīn wa-hubb al-dawla*). A further step would be the opening of elementary schools.

The increasingly evident predominance of the Christians in both cultural and economic affairs (in November 1883, during 'Abduh's first sojourn in Beirut the medical department of the Université St. Joseph was opened)¹⁹ led to 'Abduh's view of the supremacy of the West and his call for the political liberation of the Islamic peoples.²⁰ The special status of *Cebel-i Lübnân* under international guarantee, the large number of Christians with their contacts to Europe and their susceptibility to foreign influence, and Beirut's importance as a commercial center were all forces which had fostered Christian growth.²¹

Beirut's rapid economic rise during the second half of the last century created positions which for the most part were filled by Christians who had immigrated from Mount Lebanon. The steady stream of migrants was due not only to the appeal of Beirut but also to the fact that the increasing population in the mountain could not be adequately provided for. The Christian massacre of 1860 gave additional impetus to this movement. There are no conclusive data to be gleaned from our sources about the extent to which this flow of new migrants changed the ratio of Christians to Muslims. If we judge by the travel books, consular reports, and the statements of foreigners in Beirut, which Fawaz draws upon, the portion of Muslims in the population must have shrunk to a third. The Christian constituent rose to two-thirds. Before this population shift occurred the numerical proportions according to the same sources were relatively balanced.²²

The picture changes if we consult Ottoman statistics between 1880 and 1914, which demonstrate that the Muslims in the *merkez-i kaza* of Beirut during this period made up roughly half of the population. With regard to the *vilayet*, Muslims comprised as much as 80 percent of the total population.²³ It is not completely clear whether the demographic development led to a Christian majority. In any case, the Muslims must have felt eclipsed by the Christians in commerce and education. In absolute numbers the population of Beirut in 1863 was about 70,000 and towards the end of the century it was 100,000.²⁴ The arrival of Shi'ites in large numbers began only in the 1920s when their ancestral land of the Jabal 'Āmil in southern Lebanon and the Biqā' plains were incorporated into the state of Greater Lebanon under the French mandate.²⁵

One response to Christian expansion was the establishment of the above-mentioned *Maqāsid* in the year 1878. The Sunnite mercantile bourgeoisie had realized that education was the key to economic success.²⁶ The concrete goal of this benevolent organization was to provide for educational improvements where the state could not.

Against this background 'Abduh's activities gave a boost to Islamic and Arabic studies. He attracted a large group of followers who gathered in his home and in the great mosque. In Beirut he drafted the first version of his *Risālat al-tawhīd*.²⁷ His interventions underline the deplorable state of the educational system with regard to Muslim needs even after the Tanzimat reforms. The problem was not confined to the *vilayet* of Beirut but was all the more striking here where the educational level was measured against the high standards of Christian establishments. A prominent forerunner in his criticism of conditions in the educational system was the Tanzimat reformer Midhat Paşa, who was twice grand vizier. During his term as *vali* of the province of Sūriye (1878-1880) he focused his attention on the shortcomings of the school system, and encouraged the establishment of the *Maqāşid*.²⁸

Generally speaking, the history of modern education in Lebanon until the First World War is regarded as a history of Christian education. This view is justified to the extent that endeavors of the Christian community supported by religious institutions in America and Europe generated an educational niveau unrivaled in the entire Ottoman empire.²⁹ When local and foreign observers alike called Beirut the "city of schools," they were referring almost exclusively to Christian schools.³⁰

The autonomous *sancak Cebel-i Lübnân* had been administered by a Christian governor since 1861 in accordance with the terms of the "Règlement organique," but had lost its special status with the Turkish occupation. The conditions in *Cebel-i Lübnân* are not taken into consideration in this analysis because the Muslims constituted only 10 percent (of which two thirds were Shi'ites) of a total population of ca. 415,000. Of this 10.75 percent were illiterate.³¹

To be sure, the educational lead of the Christians was relatively recent. Despite the establishment especially of Maronite schools, the number of those who could read and write increased very slowly before the nineteenth century.³² It was not until the first Protestant missionaries arrived in the 1820s and set up schools at a time when trade was flourishing, that the educational system thrived and great strides were made in fostering literacy. In the end, the quantity of the local Christian schools and the quality of foreign schools which surpassed the former in significance, created a dominance which was both impressive and oppressive for Muslim observers. Two different educational systems came into being. One was essentially American and the other French. Both systems extended from kindergarten up through to the university level. The Syrian Protestant College, later the American University of Beirut, was founded in 1866. The Jesuit school of Ghazir became the Université St. Joseph in 1875.³³

The remarkable success of Christian education overshadowed the development of Muslim education.³⁴ We should not ignore the achievements

of private individuals such as the *Maqāsid* and al-Jisr's school, or of the government to alleviate the critical condition. But these efforts cannot obscure the fact that Ottoman educational policies in Lebanon were largely unsuccessful. The reasons for this failure will be discussed below mainly in the light of relevant *salnames* (almanacs).

Ottoman authorities were alarmed that public education was being forced into a defensive position. In 1884 and 1885 several mission schools had been closed by them because they had not complied with the terms of article 129 of the Law of Public Education.³⁵ Although the mission society was quick to play up this isolated measure as an act of religious intolerance, schools were not closed in areas where there was a considerable Christian population, but rather in those areas where the attempt was made to block Christian access to Muslim inhabitants. The fact that there were 59 local and 122 foreign, non-Muslim schools of which only 10 were operating with an official license speaks for itself.³⁶

In 1891, a certain Mihran Boyacıyan, who was being trained as a public servant in the governor's office in Beirut while being employed at the local *idadi*, sent a report on the foreign schools in the *vilayet* to the sultan. His experience as a teacher of geography and history in the local *idadi* provided insight into the school situation. Boyacıyan gives an account of how through missionary activity all of Europe was wooing the people of Beirut "under the mantel of education." Even the Muslims sent their children to these schools which were far removed from Ottoman patriotism. The Turkish element of the population was restricted to a few officials. He concluded, "Every patriot must shed tears of mourning when he observes foreign intellectual influence prevailing in the name of education." To mitigate the situation he recommends the following measures:

- Appointing officials to administer the educational system more efficiently
- Intensifying instruction in the Turkish language and Ottoman history
- Increasing the funds for education
- Prohibiting Muslim children from attending foreign schools
- Opening schools in the *kazas* of Sidon, Sūr, 'Akka, Haifa, and Tripoli
- Promoting the teaching of Turkish in the schools of *Cebel-i Lübnân mutasarrıflığı*
- Employing qualified teachers
- Requiring of all public servants a command of the Turkish language
- Carrying on all official correspondence in Turkish.³⁸

Comparing this plan of action to 'Abduh's suggestions for change, we see that both authors concur in their assessment of the negative effects of foreign education on Muslim citizens. Both perceive the danger inherent in the alienation of an overwhelming part of the inhabitants from their religion and their state. But despite the similarity of their views, they reach varying, sometimes conflicting, conclusions about what must be done. Whereas 'Abduh calls for instruction in Arabic, Boyacıyan advocates the priority of Turkish. The controversy about the use of Turkish in administration and education in the Arab provinces became a decisive factor in defining the relationship of Arabs to the Ottoman empire before the First World War. In 1913 the use of Arabic in schools was conceded but seldom practiced.³⁹

Three years later, in 1894, the Minister of Education, Ahmet Zühdü Paşa,⁴⁰ wrote a memorandum which confirmed the validity of Boyacıyan's report for the entire empire. Zühdü Paşa came to much the same conclusions about how to counteract the influence of foreign educational endeavors, which were especially intensive in the provinces of Selanik, Suriye, Halep and Beirut. He lists the number of foreign schools as 413, which is surely too low for the whole empire. A list of the American mission schools alone comes to 449 in 1895.⁴¹ Of the 4,547 non-Muslim Ottoman schools, 4,049 were operating without a license.⁴² Approximately 10 percent of the foreign schools were in the *vilayet* of Beirut. The statistics for 1898 list 21 such schools⁴³ and five years later there were 181 schools in operation.⁴⁴

We can see that the Turkish bureaucracy was well aware of the dangers emanating from foreign education. Whether or not this was a belated reaction to 'Abduh's memoranda we do not know. In any case, Sultan Abdülhamit seems to have read the reports of his officials and ministers when he writes that the private schools incite "hatred against our religion and against our government" and considers "this laissez-faire attitude of our minister of education . . . inexcusable."⁴⁵

But what was the structure of the Ottoman system of education? Since the middle of the nineteenth century traditional *medrese* and *mekteb* establishments had begun to encounter competition in the form of schools whose curriculum included secular subjects. Modern Turkish education had its inception in 1869 when the "law of Public Education" (*Maarif-i umumiye nizamnamesi*) made the establishment of schools compulsory for the first time. Elementary schools (*iptidaiye*) were to be set up in the villages, middle schools (*rüşdiye*) in towns with at least 500 houses, and preparatory schools (*idadiye*) in cities with at least 1,000 houses. Furthermore, the law provided for the construction of lycées (*sultani*) in the provincial capitals, various vocational and technical schools, and a university (*dârülfünun*) in Istanbul.⁴⁶

In many respects the law of 1869 remained a paper law. Only three *sultanis* were established: The *Galatasaray sultanisi*, the elite school in Istanbul,

a *sultani* in Crete, and the *Madrassa sultāniya* in Beirut mentioned earlier.⁴⁷ In other provincial centers the *idadi* schools were obliged to take over the function of the *sultanis*. In 1913 there were only eleven *sultanis*.⁴⁸ One year later there were thirty-one such secondary schools.⁴⁹

The development of the *rüşdiyye* reflects the erratic course of educational policy. In compliance with an *irade* from the year 1307 (1889), the *rüşdiyye* were closed in all places where *idadiye* existed, and the pupils and teachers were transferred to the *idadiye*. Some ten years later the *vilayet* of Beirut once again had eleven *rüşdiyye*.⁵⁰ In the academic year 1903-4 there were thirteen *rüşdiyye* (of these three were for girls) in Beirut, 'Akka, Tripoli, Lattakia, and Nablus.⁵¹

Meanwhile before the Law became effective in Beirut itself, a missionary report attests the existence of eight Muslim elementary schools with 255 pupils. Five hundred fifty students were enrolled in three schools referred to as institutions of higher education: al-Aḥmadiya, al-Qādiriya, and Rushdiyya,⁵² which was said to have been set up in 1868. The latter was surely of the *rüşdiyye* school type which had been in existence since 1838. The *rüşdiyye* linked elementary and secondary education. It was the task of this school to prepare students from the ages of eleven to sixteen for attending the Civil Service School (*Mekteb-i mülkiye*) or the War Academy (*Mekteb-i harbiye*).⁵³

Seeing that the provisions of the Law of Education were slow to be implemented, Beirut Muslims took action to improve the school situation. In 1878 the *Maqāsid* were founded, which initiated the establishment of a number of schools, especially for girls, in the course of the following four years. Similar societies were formed in Sidon, Lattakia, 'Akka, and Tripoli. In 1882 these societies were dissolved (they were reopened in 1907 or 1908) and merged with the education councils (*maarif meclisi*), which had been founded according to the Law of 1869. These councils were intended to supervise the operation of the school system in the *vilayets*. It is not clear whether 'Abduh was correct in attributing the abolishment of the *Maqāsid* to intrigues of Christian circles. 'Abd al-Qādir al-Qabbānī, the driving force behind the *Maqāsid*, places the blame on the schemes of influential Muslims who had no intention of sharing their power with these reform oriented groups.⁵⁴

Given these conditions, how were the educational needs of the Muslims met? Despite their dubious reliability and somewhat contradictory nature a few facts and figures, chiefly drawn from the *salname*, shall be quoted. A general "soft" indicator of the standard of education is the percentage of pupils in the total population. Shortly after the turn of the century (midway of the period dealt with here) the *vilayet* of Beirut, with a population of 650,000, had 39,000 pupils, or 5.9 percent.⁵⁵ This was about average for the *vilayets*. Roughly the same proportion was to be found in Janina

(Epirus) and Manastir (Balkan). The *sancak-i müstakil Kuds-i şerif* ranked at the head of the *vilayets* with a good 17 percent. The autonomous *sancak* of Zor brought up the rear with 0.3 percent.⁵⁶

In 1893 there were 205 elementary schools of the old type (*usul-i atika*). These were Koran schools for boys (*sıbyân*) funded mainly by religious foundations. Alongside these schools were 181 of the new (*usul-i cedide*) already mentioned *iptidaiye* with a total of almost 16,000 pupils, of whom 83 percent were boys.⁵⁷ In Beirut there were four public elementary schools for boys with 576 and four *iptidaiye* for girls with 247 pupils. The eighteen private Muslim schools were attended by 1,870 children.⁵⁸

Let us observe the numerical development at intervals of ten years: In 1903 there were about forty-two private Islamic schools (mostly primary) with 3,063 pupils and fifty-nine private non-Muslim schools, which were mainly *iptidaiye* with 6,773 pupils, and 122 foreign schools with 17,430 pupils. In addition, there were 338 pupils at *medreses*, religious institutions above the *sıbyân* level. At the public *idadiye* and *rüşdiye*, on the other hand, the student population was 1,493. As the number of pupils at the *iptidaiye* is not cited, we can reconstruct this figure only by subtracting the above-mentioned numbers from the total number of pupils in the *vilayet*. The number, then, is 10,972 children attending public elementary schools.

A process of consolidation and elimination reduced the number of "old" and "new" schools. Statistics for the years 1913-15 show that there were 136 public elementary schools with 7,783 pupils, 80 percent of whom were boys. In contrast, 5,792 children were instructed at 151 private Islamic primary schools and 6,444 at non-Muslim schools. The number of foreign schools comes to 157 with 13,614 girls and boys.⁶⁰ This means that three times as many children were in private as in public schools. A comparably high enrollment of private school pupils is found elsewhere only in the *vilayet* of Hüdavendigâr and in *Kuds-i şerif*. In Istanbul, for instance, there were twice as many students in private schools as in public schools. In the *vilayet* of Ankara the opposite was the case. The tendency to send children to private schools, which, of course, were not of a uniform nature and ranged from a well-equipped Jesuit school to a shabby village Koran school, can be observed also in institutions of continuing education.⁶¹

In the 136 elementary schools three hundred teachers, fifty of whom were women, were employed. A good tenth of them were graduates of a *darülmualimin*, a teacher training college. Thirty-seven had completed the *idadi*-school type and fifty-three had graduated from *medreses*. The remaining two-thirds had attended schools not otherwise specified.⁶²

The four preparatory schools in the *vilayet*, which were located in Tripoli, 'Akka, Lattakia, and Nablus, trained 485 pupils in 1913-15. The *sultani* in Beirut where 'Abduh had taught had a student population of 125

in 1895 and of 236 in 1914. By 1914 an additional *sultani* had been founded and was attended by 84 students.⁶³

In vocational education progress was made but it was often followed by setbacks. In 1907 the *Hamidiye ticaret ve sanayi mektebi* was set up at great expense. The enrollment of 300 students is an indication that the school found wide acceptance⁶⁴ although shortly thereafter the building stood empty.⁶⁵ The needs of the traditionally important silk industry were met by founding a special school, the *darülharir*.⁶⁶ In 1909 a police school (*polis mektebi*) was established.⁶⁷

The *vilayet* of Beirut did not receive postsecondary facilities until relatively late. An adequate response to the challenge presented by the two foreign universities was never made. The Law School (*Hukuk mektebi*) that was founded in Salonica was moved to Beirut along with the entire staff after the loss of Macedonia in 1912. It was reopened in October 1913.⁶⁸ The only school to have its origin in calculated educational policy was the Medical School (*Şam Türk Tıbbiye mektebi*), which was opened in Damascus in 1903 but was moved to Beirut at Cemal Paşa's bidding after the war broke out and was set up in the building of the closed medical faculty of St. Joseph university. The *Tıbbiye* was intended to counterbalance the American and French institutions, which in the view of a former professor at this college, had carried on propaganda and tried to win over the population.⁶⁹ The *Tıbbiye*, however, was never serious competition since it lacked sufficient funding. The monthly budget of the American faculty was higher than the *Tıbbiye*'s budget for the entire year.⁷⁰ On October 4, 1918, the *Tıbbiye* was closed.⁷¹

In the years following 1909 there were repeated press reports of a university (*darülfünun*) to be set up in Beirut.⁷² These plans were apparently supported by the Sharif 'Ali Haydar,⁷³ but were never realized. In 1910, the *Şabah* reported that a commission which had been formed to investigate the possibility of reopening the *Sanayi mektebi* had recommended instead the establishment of a university. The project was to be financed by an increase of twenty *para* in the Beirut railway fares.⁷⁴ But nothing came of this scheme.

It is not difficult to locate the "Achilles heel" of Ottoman education in the *vilayet* of Beirut or elsewhere at the primary level and in teacher training; 80 percent of the boys did not attend school. The situation was similar in Aleppo. The figures are better for Edirne, with 64 percent, but worse in Suriye, with 88 percent of the boys remaining illiterate. The rates of non-attendance for girls were 95 percent in Beirut, 76 percent in Edirne and 98 percent in Suriye.⁷⁵

These abstract figures are substantiated and qualified by reports in the handbook *Beyrut vilayeti* of 1917. In Tülkaram, for example, one-fourth of the 250 pupils attending the primary school came not from the city, but

from the surrounding areas. They took shelter near the school in small, filthy, abandoned shops. Recognizing the intolerability of the situation the city administration started construction of a boarding house for the pupils, but the project had to be canceled for lack of funds. On the other hand, a school where girls could learn rugknotting (*Halıcılık mektebi*) was opened in 1915, and seems to have functioned quite well.⁷⁶

The educational aspirations of citizens of the *kaza* of Bani Şa'b (*sancak* 'Akka) are well documented. The population of Safad, in contrast, manifested indifference regarding the school attendance of their children. In view of the excellent conditions in the foreign schools as opposed to the very unfavorable situation of the public schools, it was no wonder that the non-Muslims were better educated and informed. However, in World War I several schools of the military foe were closed. In *kaza* of Safad alone more than half of the twenty-two private institutions were affected by this measure. Only schools of the allies, Germany and Austria-Hungary, were spared, so that 1,000 students, chiefly of Jewish faith, could continue to attend school.⁷⁷

Many of the so-called model schools (*nümüne iptidaiye*) were handicapped by severe inadequacies. Others stood almost empty, as in Haifa.⁷⁸ In a report of the school inspector (*maarif müfettişi*) for the *sancak* of Lattakia it was declared that the provisions of the Law Concerning Primary Education⁷⁹ had not been implemented in 1916. As proof, he cited the lack of schools and the difficulty in enforcing compulsory education. The authors of *Beyrut vilayeti* noted sadly that the population did not wish to send their children to school. They saw the reason for this in the oppressive poverty which had been aggravated by the war. Parents were not able to feed and clothe their children, let alone buy school supplies.

Community involvement and initiative in the *kaza* of Jin'in provide a pleasant contrast to the overall gloomy picture. The inhabitants of this village raised the money for a second teacher when they realized that one teacher provided for in the budget was not enough. The example of this village does not seem to have been followed elsewhere. It was more often the case that schools were simply closed down when there was a shortage of teachers. The difference in educational level between Christians and Muslims was enormous. For example, in the *kaza* of 'Akka (*sancak* of Tripoli) only 5 percent of the Muslims, as compared to 50 percent of the Christians, were literate.⁸⁰

Few schools had more than one teacher. Only half of them had consisted of more than one classroom. Most school buildings were in poor condition. Almost half of the schools were assessed as *gair-i muvâfik* (unsuitable). One-fourth were classified as requiring renovation.⁸¹

Repeatedly the demand is heard for one or two model boarding schools for each *kaza* and for a new type of teacher, one who was young, active,

and educated in order to fashion true institutions of education out of those "idler's paradises" (*tembelhane*) where fanatic, ignorant, and incompetent teachers sat and waited for their salaries.⁸²

From the second constitutional period onwards controversy raged regarding what the focal point of educational endeavors should be. This lack of resolution, compounded by frequent changes of the ministers of education, impeded the development of a consistent policy on education. One minister of education, Emrullah Efendi (1858-1914), originated the *tuba ağacı*-theory, of the tree of paradise hanging by its roots from heaven, to support his case for beginning educational reform at the university level. He later dissociated himself from this view, when he realized that of the 70,000 elementary teachers needed, not even 1 percent were available.⁸³ Saṭi' al-Huṣri, on the other hand, advocated the priority of expanding elementary education. He argued quite plausibly that if there were no elementary schools there could be no middle or high schools.⁸⁴

This was the same view held in the *vilayet*. The authors of *Beyrut vilayeti* were convinced that elementary schools, which instilled in the children a sense of patriotism, had been a decisive factor in the victories of Prussia over France in 1870 and of Bulgaria over the Ottoman empire in 1913. But one decade after the Young Turk Revolution schools retained their medieval aspect. This was attributed to an incorrect concept of *mektep*. The establishment of a primary school was generally limited to allocating funds for a teacher's salary but not for expenses associated with building the school or purchasing educational materials and supplies.⁸⁵

In the Provincial General Assembly (*meclis-i umumi-i vilayet*)⁸⁶ there was an awareness of the fundamental deficiencies of the school system. In the opinion of Vali Azmi Bey, what was necessary was a revolution in education and better financial support. The prosperity of a country, according to Azmi Bey, was dependent on its educational achievements. Obviously influenced by the British withdrawal from the Dardanelles (December 1915) he believed that while the army was victorious on the battlefield, ignorance must be defeated on the home front.⁸⁷

The *vilayet* possessed one teacher's college, which had been established in 1892.⁸⁸ In 1915 the *meclis* turned its attention to developing further teacher training colleges in the centers of the *sancaks*, Lattakia, Tripoli,⁸⁹ and Nablus. Considering the shortage of qualified teachers it was widely criticized that women were not admitted to the *darülmua'llimin*. Consequently, the appeal was made for a *darülmua'llimat*. The education of women was one of the main issues in the Assembly where it was argued that educated women would raise their children to better fulfill their duties as soldiers, farmers, traders, and patriotic citizens.⁹⁰

The debate in the Provincial General Assembly leaves an ambivalent impression. Although cognizant of the situation, the *meclis* members proposed

solutions which revealed an unwarranted optimism bearing no relation to the reality represented in *Beyrut vilayeti*. While pressing concerns of the moment generally dictated educational policy, it was not uncommon for members to endeavor to acquire yet another educational institution for their constituencies.

The *vali* estimated that 1,500 additional schools would be required⁹¹ and statistics confirmed this number.⁹² The concept then, if it can be so called, was simple: more schools. It was precisely this attitude which was criticized by the authors of the handbook. Instead of calling for more schools they demanded adequate equipment for the existing schools and better qualified teachers.

The plight of education in the *vilayet* was discussed not only in the provincial parliament, but also in the *Meclis-i Mebusân* in Istanbul. In 1914 Salim 'Alî Salâm, representative for Beirut and one of the leaders of the Reform Society (*Jam-'iyat Bayrût al-işlâhîya*),⁹³ gave a speech in which he deplored the backwardness of schools in the *vilayet* and called for new taxes to finance an investment in the educational system. He declared it imperative that education in the Arab provinces receive more support because of the predominance of foreign schools.⁹⁴ Salâm's grievance was understandable. In 1913 the *vilayet* had spent only 2.95 percent of its total budget on education. The average for the empire, on the other hand, was 25 percent. In the following year there was, to be sure, a large increase as Beirut caught up with the imperial average.⁹⁵ According to Salâm only those who were interested in becoming public servants would attend a public school. A prominent case in point was Rashîd Riða, who explained that he had left the *rüşdiyye* in Tripoli because he did not intend to work for the government.⁹⁶

Shortly before the end of Ottoman rule in Lebanon, the school system received fresh impetus through the efforts of Cemal Paşa, the commanding general of the Fourth Army and de facto autonomous ruler in Syria. He appointed Halide Edip Adivar, the famous writer, and her sister Nigar Hanım as counselors. Under their direction, the *darülmuallimat*, which had been one of the demands of the provincial *meclis*, was finally established. The "Cemal Paşa-School" in Beirut was attended by girls of all religious creeds. An agricultural school was set up in Ta'nâyil Ksârah (Biqâ').⁷

Another *mekteb-i sultani* with the name *ikinci sultani* came into being alongside the already existing lycée in 1913-14. As part of a strategy to regain Arab sympathies, the courses were taught in Arabic. The school was closed less than two years later, in the summer of 1915,⁹⁸ probably in order to remove a field of activity for the Arab movement at a time when high treason trials were being conducted against Arab nationalists. The director of this *sultani*, Rustum Hâyardar from Baalbek (1886 or 1889-1940), one of the founders of the most important Arab secret society (al-Jam'îya al-'Arabîya al-Fatât), was called to Jerusalem to al-Kullîya al-Şalâhiya, a college which

had been initiated by Cemal Paşa. Although conceived as a Panislamic, "Ottomanist" theological college it became, in diametric opposition to the intentions of its founder, a center for the dissemination of Arab national thought.⁹⁹

The *Şalāḥīya* had a remarkable similarity to *al-Madrasa al-'Uthmānīya*, the most influential and effective college in Beirut for two decades. Founded in August 1895 (Rabī' al-awwal 1313), it signified the fulfillment of 'Abduh's program, which brings us back to our point of departure.¹⁰⁰

Dissatisfaction with Turkish schools as described by 'Abduh and mistrust of local Christian universities, where cases of proselytism had occurred,¹⁰¹ prompted Shaykh Aḥmad 'Abbās al-Azhari to create this institution. A graduate of al-Azhar, he had taught at the *Madrasa waṭaniya* of Buṭrus al-Bustāni for some time.¹⁰² As mentioned earlier, he served as director of *al-Madrasa al-sultānīya* where 'Abduh, with whom he shared the same political and religious convictions, had taught. In 1877-78 al-Azhari was involved in an independence movement of Syrian notables who were associated with the *Maqāshid*. It is quite probable that he was a freemason.¹⁰³ In 1909 he was defeated in the *mufti* election as a candidate of the *za'im* Aḥmad Mukhtār Bayhum.¹⁰⁴

The school's objective was to impart knowledge and learning in keeping with the spirit of national virtues (*al-akhlāq al-millīya*) and religious principles (*al-'aqā'id al-dīnīya*).¹⁰⁵ Up to 1900, when a boarding school was added, only day students could be accepted. In 1910 there were 250 students, a third of whom were boarders. School attendance was divided into two phases of four years each: preparatory (*tamhīdī*) and academic (*'ilmī*).¹⁰⁶ The language of instruction was Arabic. Despite claims of loyalty to the Ottoman and national spirit (*rūh al-'uthmānīya wa-l-waṭaniya*) only two weekly hours were allocated to Turkish in the first two years. In contrast, twelve weekly hours were devoted to French instruction and modern sciences (*al-funūn al-ḥadītha, al-'ulūm al-aṣrīya*) were taught partly in French. English was optional and German was offered after 1913.¹⁰⁷ The curriculum included religious subjects, history (biography of the prophet and history of the Arabs), geography, mathematics, and natural sciences.¹⁰⁸ Non-Muslims, too, were admitted to the school and were not obliged to learn the principles of Islam or to attend services in the mosque. On Sundays they were given the opportunity to receive instruction in their own faiths.¹⁰⁹

The expansion of the school into a college (*ma'had 'ilmī wa raqī*) in May 1911, called *al-Kullīya al-'Uthmānīya al-Islāmīya*, involved moving into larger premises in another part of the city, Burj Abi Ḥaydar. By adding two years to the curriculum and increasing the emphasis on French, students were given the opportunity to earn the baccalaureate and thereby gain acceptance to French universities. In fact, many graduates of the Kullīya

studied in France.¹¹⁰ The diplomas of the Kullīya were recognized by the authorities as equivalent to those of the public institutions.¹¹¹

The increased appeal of the college brought it into competition with the two existing universities in Beirut. Students at the Kullīya numbered between 300 and 400 in 1913, which was twice as many as at the *sultani*, even though tuition at the latter school was somewhat less costly.¹¹² A list of the names of the students at the Kullīya reads like a Who's Who for the Sunnite upper class of Beirut: Bayhum, Ghandūr, Fākhūrī, Sidānā, Ṭabbārah. Wealthy families from all parts of the Muslim world sent their sons to this school.¹¹³

More than two dozens teachers, including Sunnite *ulema* and French educationalists, catered to the needs of the students. Doctor Bashīr al-Qaṣṣār¹¹⁴ was the assistant director. The well-known Mustafa al-Ghalayīni was teacher of Arabic literature and exegesis of the Koran.¹¹⁵ Miṣbāḥ Muḥarrām,¹¹⁶ a deputy from Beirut to the *meclis* in Istanbul, taught law.¹¹⁷

The Kullīya was integrated into the economic, political, and religious life of the city. The school board included such prominent citizens as Aḥmad Mukhtār Bayhum,¹¹⁸ Muḥammad al-Fākhūrī,¹¹⁹ 'Umar al-Dā'ūq,¹²⁰ Riyād al-Ṣulḥ,¹²¹ Shaykh Aḥmad Ṭabbārah,¹²² and 'Abd al-Ghanī al'Urayṣī.¹²³ Over a fourth of the Muslim members of the Beirut Reform Society were either graduates of the school, members of the board or teachers. Shaykh Aḥmad himself was president of the Society.¹²⁴

In 1912 the Kullīya still enjoyed the favor of the government. In the report for the academic year Abu Bakr (Tepeyrah, 1864-1947) Ḥāzim conveyed his compliments as honorary chairman. He was the same *vali* who ordered the dissolution of the Reform Society the following year.¹²⁵ At a time when the Turkification policy of the Committee of Union and Progress was meeting with resistance in the form of Arab demands for greater participation in the administration of their provinces, the Kullīya became a seminal force in the development of Arab national thought. A contemporary wrote:

It was the first school which attempted to awaken in its students an understanding of Arab history and propagate among the students a spirit of Arab nationalism and a feeling for the necessity of restoring Arab greatness. I believe that many of the seeds of revolt against the repression and tyranny of the Turks were sown here. I am not claiming that all cries for the rights of the Arabs were a direct result of instruction at this school. But I am convinced that many of those who were later hanged at the gallows of a Turkish bloodshedder had received their basic education at this school.¹²⁶

Between 1900 and 1914 there were sixty-three graduates of the Kullīya. Of these, around one-third became merchants, one-fifth each became respec-

tively doctors, public servants, and employees, and the rest made careers as lawyers, educators, journalists, scientists, and engineers. This breakdown of the careers of Kullīya graduates sheds light on the social groups constituting the mainstay of Arab nationalism. As the numbers, however, refer to a single school, they do not provide conclusive evidence. And certainly not every graduate of the Kullīya is to be considered a nationalist. The professional makeup of the former Kullīya students deviates from that of the group investigated by Dawn¹²⁷ in that the prevalence of merchants was stronger in the Kullīya group. A decisive factor was probably many students came from Beirut with its intense commercial activities. In any case, a more thorough study of the social origin of the Kullīya graduates would enrich our understanding of the genesis of Arab nationalism. All the more so as the published works of these individuals are fairly easily available.¹²⁸

Salibi has pointed out that the Christian students of the Syrian Protestant College were the first generation of Arab nationalists and the Kullīya graduates the second.¹²⁹ This latter group was not fated to lead long lives. ‘Al-‘Uraysī, Maḥmūd Naja ‘Ajm,¹³⁰ Muḥamad al-Maḥmaṣānī,¹³¹ ‘Umar Ḥamad,¹³² and a member of the board, Shaykh Aḥmad Ṭabbāra, were sentenced to death by hanging for being members of various secret societies which the Turkish authorities had accused of treason. ‘Ādil Arslān, member of the Fatāt, narrowly escaped arrest, probably through the intercession of his older brother Shakīb, who in contrast to the champions of Arab independence advocated that the Arab provinces remain in the Ottoman empire.¹³³

Under these circumstances the Kullīya was a thorn in the sides of the Ottoman authorities. And yet, because of its niveau and prestige, it was an institution that they would have liked to exploit for their own purposes. This motive probably explains plans to expand the school and bring it under government control.¹³⁴ During a *meclis* debate in Beirut *vali* Azmi Bey suggested that the Kullīya be transformed into a commercial school. This suggestion seems to have been translated into action with the revival of the “Trade and Vocational School” mentioned earlier. It is surprising to find Rafiq al-Tamīmī again as the director of that *ticaret mektebi* in Beirut.¹³⁵

Thus the Kullīya was closed down and teaching activities discontinued. Al-Azharī, educator, politician, and reform theologian, was exiled to Istanbul where he eked out a meager living as an elementary school teacher in World War I.¹³⁶ It was not until February 1920 that he was able to reopen his school – this time under the name of “al-Kullīya al-Islāmīya.” After his death in 1927, the leadership of the school was assumed by his sons Kamāl and Nūrī, who had taught there before it was closed.¹³⁷

Our rather cursory account of nearly four decades of Islamic education in the *vilayet* of Beirut has come to an end. Let us recall the major lines of development. In the middle of the nineteenth century the educational

niveau of the Muslim population was very low in comparison to that of the non-Muslims, and Muslim schools played only a marginal role in the system of education. The Law of Public Education did little to change this state of affairs.

When mention was made of the "struggle of schools in Syria."¹³⁸ an allusion to the large number of foreign and local Christian schools competing with one another for influence and recognition, then the main scene of action was Beirut. The *Maqāsid*, which enjoyed the favor of the *vali* of Syria, Midhat Paşa, took the initiative among the Muslims and began to intervene in this struggle. Leading representatives of the Islamic reform movement, like 'Abduh, al-Jisr, and al-Azharī, gave a substantial boost to Islamic education, the results of which were to be felt beyond the turn of the century.

The impact of public education was limited. One reason for this was that many legal provisions had never been enforced. There were not enough schools and the organization of the single schools was subject to frequent change. Moreover, the schools did not enjoy the support or patronage of the population, in particular of the Christian sector. As a rule the language of instruction was Turkish and not Arabic, a fact which did not enhance the schools' appeal. That private schools in which students were taught in their mother tongue fared better in the public eye is demonstrated by their comparatively high enrollment.

When Ottomanism, or the concept of a multiethnic state with several languages and religions under the rule of the Ottoman dynasty, proved to be a myth, and the end of the "honeymoon" of Turkish-Arabic relations was signaled by a policy of Turkification and centralization, the result was first the alienation of a group of Arab officers, notables, and intellectuals, and then the rapid formation of a national awareness manifested in the development of the *Kullīya*. Thus there were three forces which had a decisive influence on education in the *vilayet*: Islamic reformism, the official policies of education based on the concept of Ottomanism, and finally, Arab nationalism.

As late as the autumn 1917 Tamīmī and Behcet viewed the chances for mitigating the ills of public education with optimism: "*Geç olsun da güç olmasın!*"¹³⁹ But it was too late to steer educational policies in another direction. The end of Ottoman rule in Lebanon in October of 1918 relegated such wishes to the realm of illusions.

Appendix A: Number of Schools and Students in the kaza Tarâbulus-i Şâm 1333/1917

Schools	Tarablus Boys Girls	Iskele Boys Girls	Minya Boys Girls	Dinya Boys Girls	Kurâ-i 'açere Boys Girls	Tartûs Boys Girls	Arwâd Boys Girls	Hadir Boys Girls	Total	Grand Total
Public secondary boarding school (<i>sulţânî</i>)	1								1	1
American secondary boarding school (corresponding <i>i 'dâdi</i>)	1								1	1
Public teachers college	1								1	1
Private elementary boarding school (American and Maronite)	1							1	1 - 1	2
Public elementary schools	10 - 5	2 - 2	2	2	2	1 - 1	1	1	21 - 8	29
Private non-Muslim elementary schools	2 - 1	2							4 - 1	5
Traditional elementary schools (<i>şibyân</i>)	30 - 5	1				1				37
Total	45 - 12	5 - 2	2	2	2	2 - 1	1	2	61 - 15	76
Number of students	2120 880	250 95	30	50	80	70 - 30	80	60	2740 1005	3745
Ratio students-population %	12:5	4	0:8	0:5	1:2	1:9	1:7			5:6

Source (with the exception of the last item): Beyrût vilâyeti, 2: 229.

Appendix B: Weekly curriculum for rüşdiye and i 'dâdiye-schools*

Subject	class 1	class 2	class 3	class 4	class 5	class 6	class 7
Quran and theology	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Turkish	6	5	3	2	1		
Morals	1	1		1	1	1	
Official style and literature						2	2
Arabic	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
Persian		2	2	2	1		
French			3	3	4	4	4
Legal practices						1	
Arithmetic	2	2	2	2	1		
Bookkeeping					1		
Algebra and trigonometry					2	2	
Geometry			1	1	2	1	
Cosmography							1
Mechanics, physics, chemistry						3	3
Zoology, biology, mineralogy							4
Geography	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
History		2	2	2	2	1	1
Economics						1	1
'ilm-i eşya (Elementary science)	1	1	1	1	1		
Hygiene			1	1			1
Calligraphy	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Drawing	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Total	20	22	24	24	25	24	23

* In schools at the i 'dâdiye-level Greek, Armenian and Bulgarian are taught according to demand: In classes 4, 5, and 6 two hours and in class 7 one hour. Source: Sâlnâme-i nezâret-i ma'ârif-i 'umûmiye 1317. İkinci sene. (Istanbul 1317/1899-1901) p. 230.

Appendix C: Weekly curriculum for elementary schools in villages

Subject	class 1	class 2	class 3	class 4
Alphabet	12*			
Quran	12*	6	6	6
Quran recitation			2	2
Catechism		3	3	3
Orthography		2	2	
Reading	4	3	3	5
Arithmetic	1	2	2	2
Calligraphy	1	2	1	1
Totals	18*	18	19	19

* Comparison with other syllabi shows that there is no mistake or printing error in the addition of weekly hours for class 1. But the comments to the curriculum do not explain the calculation except for the horizontal line between 12 and 12. It is merely noted that in class 1 Quran lessons begin only after laying the foundation in alphabet lessons.

Source: Sâlnâme-i nezâret-i ma'ârif-i 'umûmîye 1318 Üçüncü sene (Istanbul 1318/1900-01) p. 235.



Teachers and students of al-Kulliyah al-Islamiyyah. 'Umar Fakhuri. *Kayfa yanhaḍu* 'l-'Arab, ed. 'Abd al-Laṭif Fakhuri. Beirut, 1981.

Notes

1. The term Lebanon refers here to the coastal strip and its hinterland starting in the north at Lattakia and extending roughly as far as Jaffa in the south. In 1840 Beirut belonged to the *vilayet* of Sidon and became *sancak* of the newly organized *vilayet* of Syria in 1864. January 1, 1880 marked the inception of the *vilayet* of Beirut, which was composed of five *sancaks*: Beirut, Acre, Tripoli, Lattakia, and Nablus (also called Balqa').
2. Although open to new approaches, al-Jisr's thought was rooted in traditional Islamic dogma, as for example, in his major work *al-Risāla al-ḥamīdiyya* (1st ed., Beirut 1305/1887-88 with an introduction by Khālid Ziyāda). Albert Hourani, *Arabic thought in the Liberal Age 1798-1939* (Repr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 222-24.
3. Shakīb Arslān, *Rashīd Riḍā aw ikhā' arba'in sana* (Damascus 1356/1937), 35 ff.; 'Umar 'Abd al-Salām Tadmuri, *Tārīkh wa-āthār masājid wa-madāris Ṭarāblus fī 'aṣr al-Mamālik min al-fath al-Manṣūri hattā 'l-'ām 688-1394/1298-1974* (Tripoli, 1394/1974), 181 ff.
4. For al-Azhari's career, see below.
5. Introduction to *al-Risāla al-ḥamīdiyya*, p. 11 (cf. n. 2 above).
6. At this type of school, which was initiated in 1875, boys ages 11 to 14 were educated within the framework of a civil curriculum before going on to military school. Beginning in 1908 these schools were phased out, see Osman Ergin, *Türkiye Maarif Tarihi*, 2d ed. (Istanbul, 1977), I-II: 501-8, III-IV: 1418. There is documentary evidence of the existence of the *mekteb-i rüşdi-i askeri* in Beirut, at least since 1882, cf. Henry Diab and Lars Wählin, *The Geography of Education in Syria in 1882*. With a translation of education in Syria by Shahin Makarius, 1883. *Geografiska Annaler* 65 B,2(1983), 105-28, here: pp. 117 ff.
7. "Ihtifāl iftitāh al-Madrasa al-Sultāniyya," in *Thamarāt al-Funūn* 424 (April 16, 1883): 1. Cited by Donald Cioeta, "Islamic Benevolent Societies and Public Education in Ottoman Syria, 1875-1882," in *Islamic Quarterly* 26 (1982): 40-55, here: 55, no. 34. According to Cioeta, a school of higher education was planned by the *Maqāsid*, but was realized only after the society was incorporated into the *Maarif meclisi*. Cf. also *Tauzi' al-jawā'iz al-ihtifāli 'ala talāmīdh l-Madrasa al-sultāniyya fī Bayrūt wa hiya as-sana al-ilā lil Madrasa* (Beirut, 1883-84). Muhammad 'Abduh, 1st ed. (Cairo, 1350/1931), I: 393-97. Riḍa states that the *Maqāṣ* took the initiative in establishing this school. This shows that the *sultāniyya* was not one of the lycées which were to be established in every *vilayet* capital according to the Law of Public Education of 1869. Besides, Beirut did not become the seat of a *vilayet* until 1888. The *sultāniyya* was a local affair, supported by the Beirut authorities. Shakīb Arslān, *Sīra dhātīyya* (Beirut, 1969), p. 69 ff. writes that the *Madrasa sultāniyya* was incorporated into the public school system. The enlargement of the *sultāni* was financed by donations and grants of the *vilayet* of Sūriyye, see Maḥmūd Cevād Ibn Şeyh Nāfi', *Maarif-i umumiyye nezāreti tarihçe-i teşkilāt ve icraati* (n.p. 1338/1922), 236.
8. Riḍa, 2d. ed. (Cairo, 1344/1925-26), II: 505-11.
9. I.e., missionaries.
10. Riḍa, II: 507 ff. Cf. Abdul Latif Tibawi, "From Islam to Arab nationalism, with special reference to Egypt and Syria," in *Arabic and Islamic Themes: Historical, Educational and Literary Studies* (London, 1976), 99-153, here: 122-28.
11. Riḍa, II: 505: "If the government had acted according to his ['Abduh's] instructions . . ., Islam would have been revived and renewed."
12. Riḍa, II: 522-31.
13. *Ibid.*, 530. 14. *Ibid.*, 524. 15. *Ibid.*, 530 ff.
16. *Ibid.*, 524. 17. *Ibid.*, 526 ff. 18. *Ibid.*, 531.
19. "La Faculté de Médecine Française de Beyouth." in *Correspondence d'Orient* 4 (Mai 1911), 451-58.

20. Of the many studies on this topic we shall mention only Elie Kedourie's *Afghani and Abduh. An Essay on Religious Unbelief and Political Activism in Modern Islam* (London, 1966)
21. Kamal S. Salibi, *The Modern History of Lebanon* (Repr. Beirut, 1977), 120 ff.
22. Leila Tarazi Fawaz, *Merchants and Migrants in Nineteenth-Century Beirut*, *Harvard Middle Eastern Studies*, 18 (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1983), 44-51 and table on p. 131.
23. Kemal Karpat, *Ottoman Population 1830-1914. Demographic and Social Characteristics* (Madison, 1985), 128 ff., 158 ff., 165 ff., 176 ff.
24. Fawaz, 129; Michael Johnson, *Class and Client in Beirut. The Sunni Muslim Community and the Lebanese State 1840-1985*. Political Studies of the Middle East series, 28 (London, 1986), 12; Samir Khalaf, *Persistence and Change in Nineteenth Century Lebanon* (Beirut, 1979), 114 ff.
25. The Shi'ite counterpart to the Sunnite *Maqāsid* was the *jam'iya al-khayriya al-islamiya al-'amiliya*, which was founded in 1923; Johnson, *Class and Client*, 170.
26. *Ibid.*, 14 ff. and 47.
27. A. L. Tibawi, *A Modern History of Syria including Lebanon and Palestine* (London, 1969), 169.
28. 'Ali Haidar Midhat, *Midhat Pāşa. Vol. I: Tabsira-i 'ibret* (Istanbul, 1325/1909-10), 208 ff.
29. Theodor Hanf, "Die Hochschulen in den gesellschaftlichen Konflikten des Libanon." in *Die Islamische Welt zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit, Festschrift für Hans Robert Roemer*, ed. Ulrich Haarmann and Peter Bachmann. *Beiruter Texte und Studien*, 22 (Beirut, 1979), 230-53, here: 231. For French interests cf. John Spagnolo, "The Definition of a style of Imperialism: The Internal Politics of the French Educational Investment in Ottoman Beirut" in *French Historical Studies* 8(1973-74), 563-84.
30. K. T. Khairallah, "La Syrie." in *Revue du Monde Musulman* 19(1912), 1-143, here: 112. Martin Hartmann, *Reisebriefe aus Syrien* (Berlin, 1913), 29.
31. Salibi, 125 ff.
32. "Bericht über eine im Auftrage der Landesaufnahme von Hauptmann Trautz und Professor Dr. Bergsträßer (Univ. Stamboul) vom 24. Februar bis 19. Mai 1918 nach Syrien und Palästina ausgeführte wissenschaftliche Reise," Anlage 17: Statistik des libanon vom Jahre 1328 (1912/13). Bundesarchiv-Militärarchiv Freiburg, Nachlaß Trautz, N 508/v. 108. Cf. George Young, *Corps de droit ottoman* (Oxford, 1905-6), I: 135-54.
33. Hanf, 232. In the year 1882 the number of pupils in Christian schools was three times as high as in Muslim schools. Girls accounted for 54 percent of the students in Christian institutions as against 17 percent in Muslim schools. (Diab and Wählin, "Geography." 113).
34. Cf. the unpublished lecture given by Buṭrus Labaki (Université Libanaise, Beirut), "Mu'assasāt al-ta 'Ir fi Lubnān khilāl al-qarn al-ākhīr fi l-ḥukm al-'Uthmānī," delivered at the conference on "Intellectual Life in the Arabic Provinces in Ottoman Times," Ḥammāmāt, 15-20 March, 1988.
35. *Düstur. Tertip-i evvel* (Istanbul, 1290/1872), II: 184-219, here: 204 ff. The qualifications of the teachers had to be documented. The content of the syllabus was not allowed to run counter to "morals" and "politics." The curricula and school books had to be studied and approved by the Ministry of Education or the local school board. In 1886 a section for non-Muslim and foreign schools was established in the Ministry of Education (*mekatib-i gayri müsleme ve ecnebiye müfettişliği*), Hasan Ali Koçer, *Türkiye'de Modern Eğitimin Doğuşu* (Ankara, 1987), 126.
36. A. L. Tibawi, *American Interests in Syria 1800-1901* (Oxford, 1966), 259 ff.

37. Atilla Çetin, "II. Abdülhamide sunulmuş Beyrût vilâyetindeki yabancı okullara dair bir rapor" in *Türk Kültürü* 22/253 (1984): 316-24, here, 317.
38. Ibid., 321.
39. *Düstur. Tertip-i sani.* (Darüssaade 1332/1916), V: 318 ff.
40. Of all ministers of education, even up to the present time, Ahmed Zühdü Paşa (1833/34-1902) served the longest term (1891-1902).
41. *Tanizimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul, 1985), II: 496.
42. Atilla Etin, "Maarif Nazırı Ahmed Zühdü Paşa'nın Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'ndaki yabancı okullar hakkında raporu," *Güney-Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi* 10-11 (1983), 189-219.
43. *Salname-i nezaret-i maarif-i umumiye.* Birinci sene 1316 (Istanbul 1316/1898-99), 984-87.
44. *Salname-i nezaret-i maarif-i umumiye.* Altıncı sene 1321 (Istanbul 1321/1903-04), 429-33.
45. "Sultan Abdul Hamid II. Tagebuchblätter, herausgegeben von Ali Vehbi Bey." *Nord und Süd* 144(1913), 277-90, here: 287.
46. *Düstur*, II. *Düstur* regulations show that the school grades were repeatedly reformed and to some extent redefined over the following decades, a development which cannot be dealt with in this study. In this context I have also refrained from discussing the syllabi, aside from that of the *Kulliyya 'uthmāniyya*. In order to convey some idea of the subjects included in the curricula and the importance attached to each, the syllabi of the elementary, *rüşdi* and *idadi* schools are given in the appendix.
47. Bayram Kodaman, *Abdülhamid Devri Eğitim Sistemi* (Istanbul, 1980), 223 ff.
48. *Maarif-i umumiye nezareti ihşaiyat kalemi. 1328-29/1912-14* (Istanbul, 1334/1915-1), 16-18.
49. *Maarif umumiye nezareti ihşaiyat kalemi. 1329-30/1913-15 senesine mahûs maarif-i umumiye ihşaiyat mecmuasıdır* (henceforth abbreviated as *ihşaiyat mecmuası*) (Istanbul, 1336/1917-18), 40.
50. Maḥmūd Cevad, 341.
51. *Salname* 1321/1903-04, 420-22.
52. Tibawi, *American Interests*, 181 ff. The relatively high number of pupils in the secondary schools in comparison to the elementary schools makes the figures highly suspect.
53. Koçer, 40 and 63. Maḥmūd Cevad (p.101) records that in 1868 thirty-one *rüşdiye*, among them, probably, the one in Beirut, were set up in various provinces.
54. Cioeta, 54. For the history of this society and its branches which had a profound impact extending beyond the realm of education see Fritz Steppat, "Eine Bewegung unter den Notablen Syriens 1877-78. Neues Licht auf die Entstehung des arabischen Nationalismus." *ZDMG Suppl. I XVII.* Deutscher Orientalistentag, (Würzburg 1968). Vorträge, Teil 2, ed. Wolfgang Voigt (Wiesbaden, 1969), 631-49 (for a list of older, relevant studies). Simon Shamir, "Midhat Pasha and the Anti-Turkish Agitation in Syria," *Middle Eastern Studies* 10 (1974): 115-41; Najib Saliba, "The Achievement of Midhat Pasha as Governor of the Province of Syria, 1878-1880." *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 9 (1978): 307-23; Linda Schatkowski, "The Islamic *Maqāsid* of Beirut: A Case Study of Modernization in Lebanon." (M.A. thesis, American University of Beirut, 1969), 24-63.
55. *Salname* 1321, 416. I have corrected the 5.6 percent, which was miscalculated, to 5.9 percent.
56. *Salname-i nezaret-i maarif umumiye.* Dördüncü sene 1319/1901-02 (Istanbul, 1319). Appendix following p. 985. A comparison was not made with the statistical data in Vital Cuinet, *Syrie, Liban et Palestine* (Paris, 1896), 58 ff. This study, although otherwise reliable, lists highly unlikely numbers in the area of education.
57. *Salname* 1316/1898-99, 1256. *Devlet-i âliye-i osmaniye'nin 1313 senesine mahus istatistik-i umumisidir* (Istanbul, 1316/1898-99), 63, cited from Justin McCarthy, *The Arab World*,

- Turkey, and the Balkans (1878-1914). *A Handbook of Historical Statistics* (Boston, 1982), 117.
58. *Salname-i vilayet-i Beirut* 1311-12/1893-95, defa 1 (Beirut, 1310/1894-95), 242-44 (the divergence of dates occurring here and elsewhere in this text are due to the simultaneous use of *hicri* and *mali* calendars).
59. *Salname* 1321, 424-26.
60. *Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, 2-7; Henry Harris Jessup, *Fifty-Three Years in Syria* (London, 1910), II: 815. For the year 1909 he lists the number of Muslim schools as thirty-six with 4462 students. The number of non-Muslim schools at forty-eight and foreign schools at forty-three with the students at both totaling 8794. This means that 33.7 percent of all students were Muslims.
61. *Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, 6 ff. The table of statistics for the *kaza* Tripoli shows that of the seventy-six educational institutions thirty-one were public and thirty-seven *sıbyân* schools were owned privately or by the *evkâf*. Cf. appendix below.
62. *Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, 34-37.
63. *Ibid.*, 40 ff. In 1915 the *idadi* in Tripoli was transformed into a *sultani*, see *Korrespondenzblatt der Nachrichtenstelle für den Orient* 2/7 (6.11.1915): 37, citing a report in the Beirut newspaper *al-Ittihād al-'Uthmānī*.
64. The driving force behind this and other educational endeavors was 'Abd al-Qādir al-Qabbānī. The report on the opening of the school was published in *Beyrut vilayeti gazetesi* 939 (20 August 1323/1907), reprinted in *Salname-i vilayet-i Beyrut* 1326/1908, defa 7 (Beirut 1326/1908), 96-99. Cf. also "Maktab al-šanā'i," in *al-Mufid* 557 (*Kanun al-avval* 12.1910): 'Abd al-Ghanī al-Urayisi, *Mukhḥārāt al-Mufid*, ed. Nāji 'Allūsh (Beirut, 1981), 245 ff.
65. Hartmann, *Reisebriefe*, 33.
66. Ergin, III-IV: 875. *Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, 88, indicates nineteen students.
67. Ergin, III-IV: 1498. Mustafa Ergün, "II. Meşrutiyet Devrinde Eğitim Hareketleri (1908-1914)" (Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, Ankara, 1978), 407.
68. Ergin, III-IV: 880; Ergün, 462. In 1914, sixty-five students were enrolled there; see *Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, 77.
69. Ali Rıza Atasoy, *Şam Türk Tıbbiye Mektebi Tarihi* İstanbul Üniversitesi, Tıp Tarihi Enstitüsü, 30 (Istanbul, 1945), 3-5; Ergin, III-IV: 878 ff.
70. Atasoy, *Şam Türk Tıbbiye* 20. From 1913 to 1915, 286 students were enrolled at the *Tıbbiye* (*Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, 77). Several graduates of the *Tıbbiye* attained high political positions, e.g. Tevfik Rüşti Aras (1883-1972), who was foreign minister under Atatürk from 1925 to 1938. See Erik Zürcher, *The Unionist Factor. The Role of the Committee of Union and Progress in the Turkish National Movement 1905-1926* (Leiden, 1984), 49, no. 28. Another former student of the *Tıbbiye*, Ahmad Qadr, became physician-in-ordinary to King Faysal of Iraq; cf. his memoirs, *Mudhakkirātī 'an al-thawra al-'arabiya al-kubrā* (Damascus, 1956).
71. Atasoy, *Şam Türk Tıbbiye*, 42.
72. Ergün, 460. See also the version of a report of *al-Ittiḥyād al-'uthmānī* (20-27 September, 1909) in *Revue du Monde Musulman* 9(1909), 496, and the commentary by Martin Hartmann, *Der islamische Orient. III: Unpolitische Briefe aus der Türkei* (Leipzig, 1910), 250.
73. George Stitt, *A Prince of Arabia: The Emir Shereef Ali Haidar* (London, 1948), 121.
74. *Sabah*, no. 7290, 26 Kanun-i evvel 1325/10.1.1910.
75. *Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, 10-21.
76. Refik Temimi-Mehmet Behcet, *Beyrut vilayeti*. I: Cenub kısmı (Beirut, 1333/1917), 190-92; II: Şimal kısım. The two volumes (a planned third volume was not published) are usually included in the *salnames*, e.g. in Hasan Dunan, *Ottoman Year Books (Salname*

and *Neusal*) (Istanbul, 1982), 44 ff. In my opinion these are not *salnames* because they lack the characteristic structure. It is more likely that these volumes constitute a kind of area handbook. They were already used and evaluated in "Bericht über eine im Auftrage der Landesaufnahme . . ." (cf. n. 32). Mehmet Behcet (Yazar) (1890-1980) came from Aleppo. He graduated from the *Hukuk mektebi* in 1910 and became deputy director of the *sultani* in Beirut. Behcet was one of the writers of the *Fecr-i âti* movement and published several books of poetry as well as literary anthologies. Temimi (Rafiq al-Tamimî) was born in Nablus in 1890. He studied at the *Mülkiye mektebi* in Istanbul and at the Sorbonne in Paris where he was one of the founders of the most important Arab secret society, *al-Jam'îya al-'Arabiya al-Fatât*. Tamimî died in Damascus in 1957. Ya'qûb al-'Awdât, *Min a'lâm al-fîkr wal-adab fi Filastîn* (Amman, 1976), 79 ff.

77. *Beirut vilayeti*, I: 319 ff. and 371.
78. *Ibid.*, 247.
79. This law had replaced the Law of Public Education. "Tedrîsât-i iptidaiye kanun-u muvakkati" (twenty-third September, 1329/1913). *Düstur. Tertip-i sani* (Istanbul, 1332/1913-14), V: 804-23.
80. *Beirut vilayeti*, I: 230; II: 320 and 536 ff.
81. *Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, 1 ff.
82. *Beirut vilayeti*, I: 247.
83. Ergin, III-IV: 1277 ff.
84. On Husri's (1882-1968) career see William Cleveland, *The Making of an Arab Nationalist: Ottomanism and Arabism in the Life and Thought of Sati' al-Husri* (Princeton, 1971).
85. *Beirut vilayeti*, II: 223 and 536.
86. The General Provincial Assemblies (*meclis-i umumi-i vilayet*) were, responsible for the construction and maintenance of roads, commerce, handicrafts and agriculture as well as questions of taxation. The Assemblies were composed of two Muslims and two non-Muslims for each *sancak*. In the Beirut Provincial Assembly with five *sancaks*, there were twenty representatives plus the *vali* ex officio. The president of the Provincial Assembly in Beirut was Muhammad al-Jisr from Tripoli, the son of Husayn al-Jisr who was mentioned above.
87. *Beirut vilayeti meclis-i umumisinin üçüncü devre-i ictimâ'îyesinde cereyân eden müzâkerâtın zabtıdır 1331* (Beirut, 1332/1916) (henceforth abbreviated *zabt*), 154.
88. In 1892; Maḥmūd Cevad, 342.
89. One such *darülmualimin* was opened a short time later in Beirut (*Beirut vilayeti*, II: 228 ff.)
90. *Zabt*, 154-59. 91. *Ibid.*, 159.
92. In *Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, (p.17) a figure of 2483 required schools is mentioned.
93. The Reform Society was founded in Beirut in 1912 with the aim of effecting a reform program for the Arab provinces.
94. Kamal Salibi, "Beirut under the Young Turks: As depicted in the Political Memoirs of Salim 'Ali Salām (1868-1938)." *Les Arabes par leurs archives XVIIe-XXe siècles*, eds. Jacques Berque and Dominique Chevallier (Paris, 1976), 193-215, here: 211.
95. Ergün, 273 ff. In general the expenses for education were financed through a special tax amounting to approximately 0.5 percent of the tithe (*öşür*) (although it varied within the period of time dealt with here).
96. Arslan, *Rîda*, 35.
97. Cemal Paşa, *Hatıralar. İttihat-Terakki, Birinci Dünya Savaşı Anıları*, ed. Behcet Cemal. (n.p. 1959; new ed., Istanbul, 1977), 398 ff. German translation Ahmed Djemal Pascha, *Erinnerungen eines türkischen Staatsmannes* (München, 1922), 308 ff. Ismâ'il Haqqî Beg,

- Lubnān. Mabāḥith 'ilmīya wa-ijtimā'īya*, ed. Fu'ād Afrām al-Bustānī (Beirut, 1969-70; manshūrāt al-jamī'a al-Lubnāniya. Qism al-dirāsāt al-tārikhiya, 18), II: 596 ff.
98. *Düstur*. Tertib-i sani, V: 786; Nevzat Ayas, *Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Milli Eğitimi* (Ankara, 1948), 227 ff.; *Ihsaiyat mecmuası*, 40.
99. In my "Al-Kullīya as-Salāhiya in Jerusalem: Arabismus, Osmanismus und Panislamismus im Ersten Weltkrieg" (manuscript). For Ḥaydar's biography see Khayr al-Dīn al-Zirikli, *al-A'lām. Qāmūs tarājim li-ashhar al-rijāl wa'l-nisā'min al-'Arab wa'l-musta'ribīn wa'l-mustashriqīn*. 6th ed. (Beirut, 1984), 124 ff.
100. The founding year of the institution is often given as 1898. Salibi, 203 and Rashid Khalidi, "Abd al-Ghani al-Uraisi and *Al-Mufid*: The Press and Arab Nationalism Before 1914." *Intellectual Life in the Arab East 1890-1938*, ed. Marwan Buheiry (Beirut, 1981), 38-46, here: 41. In the publication of the school, however, the founding year is given as 1313/1895. For a short characterization of the school see Hans Kohn, "Der arabische Nationalismus," in *Zeitschrift für Politik* 17 (1927), 26-46, here: 29; Hartmann, *Reisebriefe*, 31 ff.
101. A conflict at the college led to the establishment of yet another school. When several Muslim students did not want to participate in Christian religious services, they were expelled. Two Indians, the brothers 'Abd al-Jabbār and 'Abd al-Sattār al-Khayrī (the former was a graduate of the Islamic College at Aliqarh) who had operated an elementary school named *Dār al-Funūn* in 1880 and studied at the Syrian Protestant College themselves, opened a *Dār al-'Ulūm*. This school, however, lacked students, as the Kullīya apparently was able to fulfill this need adequately. Both schools were supported by a committee headed by Aḥmad Mukhtār Bayhum. See Hartmann, *Reisebriefe*, 33, 109; Khairallah, 60; Fawaz, 117.
102. Butrus Abu Manneh, "The Christians between Ottomanism and Syrian Nationalism: The Ideas of Butrus al-Bustānī" in *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 11(1980), 287-304, here: 294.
103. Steppat, 643; Zirikli, I: 142.
104. Johnson, *Class and Client*, 68 ff.
105. In the following I refer to various brochures of the school marked in the order of chronological publication by the letters A-D. A: *al-Madrasa al-'Uthmāniya*. n.p.n.d. (approx. 1910-11). B: *al-Bayān al-Sanawī li'l-Kullīya al-'Uthmāniya al-Islāmiya* (Beirut, 1329/1911). C: *al-Bayān al-Sanawī li'l-Kullīya al-'Uthmāniya al-Islāmiya* (Beirut, 1330/1912). D: *Bayān al-Kullīya al-Islāmiya fi Bayrūt* (Beirut, 1351/1932-33). A. 2.
106. A, 5 ff. 107. B, 1; A, 14 ff. 108. A, 7-14.
109. A, 21. 110. B, 2-7. 111. C, 15.
112. Hassān 'Alī Hallāq, ed., *Mudhakkirāt Salīm 'Alī Salām (1868-1938)* (Beirut, 1982), 197.
113. A, 25-28; B, 50-53; C, 59-61; D, 26-28.
114. 1883-1935, graduate of the Syrian Protestant College. (Zirikli II: 57).
115. 1886-1944, disciple of 'Abduh (Zirikli, VII: 244 ff.).
116. 1853-1931 (Zirikli, VII: 98 ff.).
117. C, 7 ff.
118. 1878-1920. Together with Salām leader of the Sunnites in Beirut.
119. Played an important role in the mandate period.
120. Mayor of Beirut at the end of the First World War and head of the short-lived provisional Sharifian government (October 1918); Johnson, *Class and Client*, 22.
121. 1893-1951. First prime minister of the Republic of Lebanon 1943-1945 and 1946-1951. Al-Ṣulḥ for the Sunnites and Bishāra al-Khūr representing the Maronites concluded the unwritten *National Pact* in 1943 which laid down the political system and a *modus vivendi* for the religious communities.