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This study is intended to be a contribution to nineteenth century Egyptian historiography with particular reference to a discussion of aspects of the economic and social role and activities of the Greek community in Alexandria. Given, however, the almost total absence of studies on the role and activities of the modern history of the Greeks in Egypt, this study constitutes both a pioneering and preliminary contribution.

The study of aspects of the nineteenth century history of the Greek community in Alexandria has been carried out within a wider analytical framework of the socio-economic and political transformations experienced by Egyptian society as a whole. In particular, this study has attempted to examine the manner in which Egypt was incorporated into the global capitalist economy during the nineteenth century, and the effects of this incorporation on the socio-economic and political development of the whole of Egyptian society. Furthermore, this study has been concerned to indicate that Egypt's incorporation into the global capitalist economy, as a dependent producer of a single agricultural commodity, cotton, was due primarily to the dialectical nature of centre-periphery relations rather than the failure of modernisation or simply the unilateral penetration of foreign capital.

This study argues that during the nineteenth century the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria exemplified at one and the same time forms
of ethnic communal solidarity, pioneering bourgeois characteristics and important contradictions based on their differential association with merchant and interest-bearing capital. Thus, the study refrains from using such simplistic and inadequate analytical categories as 'Greek', 'compradore' or 'indigenous capitalist' in order to characterise all the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria during this period. Instead, the study argues that the Greek community in Alexandria reflected the contradictory and complex process of modern Egyptian historical development. In this respect, the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria exemplified simultaneously ethnic, non-capitalist, capitalist and compradorial characteristics. This study, therefore, concludes that the Greek community in Alexandria contributed both to the process which facilitated the introduction and ultimate domination of foreign capital in Egypt, and the simultaneous process which resisted foreign capitalist domination.

The substantive concern of this study, however, is with the characterisation of the Greek community in Alexandria during the nineteenth century. In order to accomplish this objective the study relies to a great extent on the plethora of Greek publications and archival material that are located in the various socio-economic, religious and cultural institutions of the community in the city of Alexandria, and the Alexandria Greek Consular archives. To a much lesser degree the study has also examined briefly the archives of the other Greek communities in Egypt which are presently located either in Alexandria or Cairo. Although there are numerous Greek institutions in the city of Alexandria, all of which have their own archives and libraries, the material for this study was collected from the following institutions: the Greek community archives and library, the Greek
Orthodox Patriarchate library, the Greek Chamber of Commerce archives and library, and the Greek Consular archives.

The Alexandria Greek community archives constitute an important source of historical material for the modern history of the community. These archives have material related to the various socio-cultural activities of the community dating back to the early 1840s. Unfortunately, due to the dramatic decline of the Greek community in Alexandria in the 1960s, and especially its financial resources, a number of the buildings owned by the community were sold. Thus, the archives were moved to two rooms in the basement of one of the Greek schools in the city, and stored in an un-systematic and haphazard manner. Similarly, the extensive library of the Greek community has been reduced to a few volumes, while the majority of its collection has been distributed to numerous institutions in Greece. (Ministry of Culture, 1987) In many respects, therefore, the use of the Greek community archives and library represented a major challenge. A similar situation prevailed with regard to the material of the Greek Chamber of Commerce in Alexandria.

In distinct contrast, the extensive library of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Alexandria was well organised, in spacious accommodation, and maintained by a fully qualified librarian and three assistants. Furthermore, and as far as it was possible to determine, the Patriarchate library seemed to have copies of practically all the Greek publications that had been produced in Alexandria during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries - whether they be books, pamphlets, newspapers or journals. This is in addition to the fact that it is the repository for the archives of the various Greek communities that were established throughout Lower Egypt.
Furthermore, the Patriarchate library had the advantage of having been the work place of Evgenios Michailidis, who over a number of years organised the material and ensured that copies of all the items in his two comprehensive studies, *Βιβλιογραφία των Ελλήνων Αιγύπτιων, 1853-1966* (Bibliography of the Greek Egyptians, 1853-1966) (1966), and *Πανοράμα: Δημοσιογραφία, 1862-1972* (Panorama: Journalism, 1862-1972) (1972), were located in the library. Subsequent to his retirement, Michailidis was replaced by his son who is the current fully qualified curator of the library. At the time of the research for this study, both father and son were working in the library and assisted in the efforts to locate the necessary material. In this respect, therefore, this study relied extensively on the Patriarchate library for the sources that were used.

As might be expected, the Greek Consular archives in Alexandria are relatively well maintained and thus were also an important source for this study. This is particularly so when it is pointed out that for a number of years, subsequent to the establishment of the community, the President of the community was also the Greek Consul-General in Alexandria. Furthermore, as this study points out, the Greek Consulate in Alexandria attempted on numerous occasions to involve itself in the affairs of the community, and in some cases succeeded. A number of issues pertaining to particular developments in the history of the Greek community, therefore, have been discussed with reference to material from the Greek Consular archives. Furthermore, the archives of the Greek community in Cairo were used solely for the purpose of collecting some general data pertaining to the establishment and development of the Greek communities in Cairo and Upper Egypt, which constitute a secondary concern of this study.
It should also be pointed out at this point that four studies relating to the modern history of the Greeks in Egypt have been used extensively throughout the present study. The studies are: Christos Hadziiossif, *La Colonie Grecque en Egypte* (1980), Athanase G Politis, *L'Hellenisme et l'Egypte Moderne* (1929 & 1930), and Stratis Tsirkas, *Ο Πολιτικός Καβάφης* (The Political Cavafy) (1971) and *Ο Καβάφης και η Εποχή του* (Cavafy and his Epoch) (1973). There are two reasons for the extensive use of these four studies. First, the un-published doctoral work of Hadziiossif and the two published volumes by Politis, who was the Greek Consul-General in Alexandria during the 1920s, constitute the only systematic and scholarly historical accounts of the role and activities of the Greeks in Egypt during the nineteenth century which rely extensively on Greek archival material and primary sources. Thus, in order to assist the non-Greek readers of this study, who may want to pursue certain issues, wherever possible the studies of Hadziiossif and Politis have been used instead of Greek archival sources. Of course, such references to both these studies have been made only after the author of the present study has been satisfied that they reflect adequately the material in the archives themselves. Second, the two volumes published by Tsirkas, and in distinct contrast to the work of Hadziiossif and Politis, represent the only studies whose analysis and characterisation of the Greek community in Alexandria during the nineteenth century converges with that presented in this study. Furthermore, although both studies focus on the literary production of the modern Greek poet Cavafy, the socio-historical accounts rely extensively on Greek archival material and primary sources from Alexandria. Thus, Tsirkas' two studies have been used with regard to a number of substantive issues which were seen to be
central to the analytical argument, and in order to assist the Greek readers, living outside Egypt, who wish to pursue these issues.

A similar situation pertains to the use of a number of secondary sources in English which focus on the socio-economic and political history of modern Egypt. This is especially the case with regards to the use of A E Crouchley, *The Investment of Foreign Capital in Egyptian Companies and Public Debt* (1936) and *The Economic Development of Modern Egypt* (1938), and E R J Owen, *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy, 1820-1914: A Study in Trade and Development* (1969). The analytical and methodological orientation of both Crouchley and Owen stands in distinct contrast to that used in this study. Nevertheless, their systematic and scholarly presentation especially of data related to Egypt's modern economic history makes them invaluable sources. This is particularly so when it is pointed out that the alternative is the numerous studies published by Egyptian socio-economic historians in Arabic, and thus inaccessible to the non-Arabic reader. Of course, as with the Greek material, the substantive material from Crouchley and Owen was used only when it reflected closely the data presented by the Egyptian historians. Thus, in order to assist the non-Arabic reader, this study uses Crouchley and Owen wherever possible. It should also be pointed out, however, that many of the Egyptian studies also rely extensively on the work of Crouchley and Owen. This is primarily due to the fact that Egyptian historiography in Arabic, which has a socio-economic orientation, did not develop systematically until the early 1970s. (Gran, 1978)

With regard to the theoretical and methodological orientation employed in this study, reference has been made primarily to scholarship that has emerged and debates that have developed in fields other than Middle East studies in general or Egyptian historiography in particular. The
reasons for this are discussed at some length in the Introduction and do not need to be reproduced here. It is important to point out, however, that the only study of nineteenth century Egypt, by an Egyptian scholar, which converges with the analytical orientation of the present study is that of Hossam Issa, *Capitalisme et Sociétés Annonymes en Egypte. Essai sur le raport entre structure sociale et droit* (1970). Nevertheless, Issa is primarily concerned with the development of juridical structures and thus the value of his book for the present study is greatly reduced.

As the Introduction argues at some length, Middle East studies in general and Egyptian historiography in particular are characterised by a paucity of theoretical and methodological debates. It is only in the area of contemporary rural sociology in Egypt that some recent contributions have attempted to introduce debates and issues which have pre-occupied scholars in other fields of non-European studies for a number of years. The absence of such debates in Middle East studies and Egyptian historiography is underscored by two recent reviews of the literature. 'Ali Mukhtar's article, "Istimrariyyat ashkal al-intaj ghair al-ra'smaliyya fi'l-qita' al-rifi" (Persistence of non-capitalist relations in the rural sector) (1985), reviews the Egyptian literature and concludes that the study by Glavanis and Glavanis (1983) is the first attempt to introduce such debates in the study of modern Egyptian society. Furthermore, Mahmud 'Abd al-Fadil's book, *al-Tashkilat al-Ijtima'iyyah we'l-Takwinat al-Tabaqiyya fi'l-Watan al-'Arabi. Dirasa tahliliyya li-aham al-tatawwurat we'l-ittifahat khilal al-fatra 1945-1985* (Social Formations and Class Structures in the Arab World. An analytical study of the major developments and orientations during the period 1945-1985) (1988: 96-9), includes only Glavanis and Glavanis (1983) in his discussion of approaches to the study of rural sociology.
in the Arab world which adopt a methodological framework that emphasises the dialectic of centre-periphery relations and thus the persistence of non-capitalist relations in the periphery. It is in this respect, therefore, that this study of the Greek community in Alexandria during the nineteenth century constitutes a new methodological departure in Egyptian historiography in that it adapts debates from rural sociology to the study of history.

It is for this reason that the Introduction to this study presents a number of different arguments which constitute important elements in the construction of the methodological framework employed in this study of both modern Egyptian history and the nineteenth century history of the Greek community in Alexandria. The Introduction presents four different styles of analytical discussion: first, a discussion of the theoretical orientations which examine the formation and development of the global capitalist economy; second, a discussion of those studies which focus on the study of biography and community as a means of abstracting general historical trends; third, an attempt to locate modern Egyptian history in the wider context of the development of the global capitalist economy; and fourth, a critical evaluation of the existing interpretations of modern Egyptian history.

Given the existence of the limited number of studies on the role and activities of the Greeks in Egypt, chapter one attempts to argue that material produced by the Greeks in Egypt ought to constitute an important source for the study of nineteenth century Egyptian history. This is accomplished through a discussion of the relevance and contribution of the Greek sources in Alexandria with respect to the analysis of three aspects of Egyptian history during this period: first, the cultivation and marketing of cotton; second, the role of Muhammad
'Ali - ruler of Egypt from 1805 to 1848 - in initiating transformations which characterised Egyptian history for the rest of the century; and third, the British military occupation of Egypt in 1882. Having presented an argument for the necessity of using Greek material from Alexandria for the study of nineteenth century Egyptian socio-economic and political history, chapter two presents the biographies of fourteen Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria as a means of highlighting both the general characteristics of the Greek community and the different socio-economic and political orientations of its prominent and influential members.

Following the presentation of the general characteristics of the Greek community in Alexandria, chapter three offers an interpretation of the transformations experienced by Egyptian society during the nineteenth century. This chapter performs a dual purpose: first, it presents a substantive application of methodological arguments discussed in the Introduction, and, second it provides the general framework within which to analyse the substantive discussion of the activities and role of the Greeks in Alexandria. Chapters four and five, respectively, present an analytical discussion of the economic activities of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria and the establishment and development of the Greek community in that city during the nineteenth century. Finally, the Conclusion attempts a brief characterisation of the Greek community in Alexandria during the early part of the twentieth century. This is accomplished through an analytical discussion of the establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce in 1901, and the interpretations of Cavafy's poetry. The reason for such an un-conventional Conclusion is to highlight even further the specificity and particularity of the nineteenth century history of the Greek community in Alexandria.
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To my supervisor, Professor John Saville, I owe special thanks and deep gratitude for critical comments, encouragement, support and patience throughout the lengthy period of writing this thesis. In particular, I am indebted to him for his continual efforts to guide me between the two extremes of empiricism and vacuous theoretical discourse. Furthermore, his willingness to take me on as a postgraduate student and his patience and scholarly critiques in guiding my early readings left a profound effect on my entire intellectual and academic development. It enabled me to abandon the intellectually sterile field of Orientalism and Middle East Studies and find inspiration in the discipline of economic and social history and the historical materialist approach. For this, I am especially grateful. Finally, I am also indebted to his willingness to read through and comment on the entire manuscript in a very short period of time.

It is to my wife and colleague Kathy Glavanis that I owe the deepest gratitude for her consistent encouragement and support, without which this project would have never been completed. I also wish to acknowledge the value of her critical comments and the theoretical and conceptual debates we had over a number of years which played a central role in the formulation of the analytical framework employed here. Furthermore, her own pioneering work in the field of rural sociology, with reference to the Middle East and Egypt in particular, introduced me to a number of debates which ultimately constituted the central arguments of the analytical framework being employed in this thesis. Finally, I wish to thank her for volunteering to undertake the painstaking task of proofreading this manuscript.

The development of my overall conceptual approach to the study of Third World societies in general and Egypt in particular owes much to the work
of and discussions with Dr Talal Asad, whose insights and critical approach to social theory had a profound effect on my own thinking. To Dr Enid Hill, a dear friend and colleague, I also owe much gratitude for her numerous contributions towards the completion of this project. Not only did she place her home at my disposal on my numerous visits to Egypt, but in particular it was the critical discussions about Egyptian history and society which in many respects contributed to the development of my own critical perception of the country in which I was born.

I am also greatly indebted to my mother Anna Glavanis, my father Michalis Glavanis and my brother Christos Glavanis who in many different ways contributed to the completion of this project. All three assisted financially at times when it was needed, but it was their continuous moral encouragement and loyalty throughout the years which ensured ultimately that the project would be completed. It is for this reason that I am deeply sorry that my father is not alive to see the project completed. Finally, but not least, I have a special debt to Margaret Bell who selflessly volunteered to undertake a number of technical matters related to the proper submission of this thesis.

Financial support for this research project and its completion was provided by two institutions, the University of Hull which funded three years of postgraduate study and an extended visit to Egypt and the Centre for Middle Eastern Studies at Durham University which funded several short visits to Egypt. My appreciation to both institutions is acknowledged.

Finally, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the many Palestinian friends in occupied Palestine. Their continuous struggle for self-
determination and especially their numerous sacrifices during the
INTIFADA have constituted an important source of inspiration which
indirectly motivated me to complete this project. It is the courage,
determination and self-sacrifice of such friends as Umm-Sufiyan, Walid
and Abu-'Adil, to mention but a few, which inspired me and sustained me
during the last stages of completing this manuscript.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**PREFACE** i

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** x

**LIST OF TABLES** xvii

**NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION and WEIGHTS, MEASURES & COINS** xix

**INTRODUCTION:** 1

I. The Global Capitalist Economy: Theoretical Remarks 4

II. Biography and Community: Legitimate Objects of Historical Analysis 14

III. Historical Contextualisation: Methodological Remarks 23

IV. Nineteenth Century Egyptian History: Some Critical Remarks 43

Footnotes 69

**CHAPTER ONE: A Lacuna in Modern Egyptian History: The Role of the Greek Community in Nineteenth Century Transformations** 71

I. Egypt's Agrarian Revolution: The Introduction of Cotton 80

II. The Foundation of Modern Egypt: The Era of Muhammad 'Ali 87

III. The British Military Occupation: The Events of 1882 108

Footnotes 121

**CHAPTER TWO: Biography as History: A Study of Fourteen Greek Families in Alexandria** 123

I. The Formation of a Mercantile Aristocracy: 1805 - 1848 135

1. Count Ioannis d'Anastasy 138

2. Michalis Tossitsas 140

3. Stefanos Zizinias 142

4. Petros Cavafy 145

5. Konstantinos Sinadinos 148

6. Konstantinos Zervoudachis 149

II. Merchants and Bankers: 1849 - 1860 153

1. Theodoros Rallis 160

2. Ioannis Choremis 163

III. Merchants, Bankers and Industrialists: 1861 - 1882 165

1. George Averoff 170

2. Konstantinos Salvagos 174

3. Emmanuil Benakis 176

4. Theocharis Kotsikas 179
REFERENCES

A. Archives
B. Newspapers
C. Greek Communities: Alexandria and Egypt
D. Greece and Greeks: General
E. Egypt: General
F. Middle East: General
G. Theory: General

APPENDICES

I. Minutes of the 1843 meeting of the community from (Radopoulos, 1928: 12-4) and translated into French from (Politis, 1929: 262-4).
II. The 1854 Founding Statutes of the community from a version published in Athens in 1854, and an English translation.
III. The original 1901 Founding Statutes of the Greek Chamber of Commerce in French.
IV. Description of the material in the archives of the Greek Community of Alexandria
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1: Cotton Types Developed by Greeks 81
Table 1.2: Cotton Types Planted in the Delta, 1865-1927 81
Table 1.3: Average Prices for SAKEL and ASHMOUNI, 1912-1928 82
Table 1.4: Additional Value Contributed by SAKEL to Total Cotton Exports, 1913-1928 83

Table 3.1: Cultivated and Cropped Land, 1821-1884 193
Table 3.2: Production Indices for Eight Crops, 1821-1879 196
Table 3.3: Population Increases, 1800-1882 198
Table 3.4: Population Increase, 1821-1878 198
Table 3.5: Increase of Urban and Rural Population, 1821-1875 199
Table 3.6: Indices of Agricultural Growth, 1821-1878 199
Table 3.7: Indices of Agricultural Growth, 1821-1878 199
Table 3.8: Ship Arrivals in Alexandria, 1850-1872 206
Table 3.9: Value of Foreign Trade, 1838-1880 211
Table 3.10: Egyptian Foreign Trade, 1841-1879 211
Table 3.11: Major Egyptian Exports from Alexandria, 1831-1879 212
Table 3.12: Exports of Egyptian Cotton, 1874-1879 212
Table 3.13: Destination of Egyptian Cotton Exports, 1835--1879 212
Table 3.14: Foreign Citizens in Egypt, 1836-1882 227
Table 3.15: Population Increases in Cairo and Alexandria, 1800-1882 227
Table 3.16: Indices of Agrarian Growth, 1872-1899 233
Table 3.17: Estimated Value of Agricultural Production, 1886-1899 234
Table 3.18: Acreage of Different Crops, 1879-1899 234
Table 3.19: Distribution of Land Ownership in 1884 235
Table 3.20: Distribution of Land Ownership in 1900 236
Table 3.21: Cotton and Cotton Seed Exports, 1880-1899 237
Table 3.22: Egyptian Foreign Trade, 1880-1899 239
Table 3.23: Balance of Trade and Interest Payments, 1884-1897 240
Table 3.24: Paid-up Capital and Debentures of Companies, 1883-1897 242
Table 3.25: Percentage of Securities Held Abroad, 1882-1897 242
Table 3.26: Capital Inflows and Interest and Dividends Paid, 1883-1897 243
Table 3.27: Net Balance of Payments, 1884-1897 243
Table 3.28: Paid-up Capital and Debentures of Industrial Companies, 1883-1897 245
Table 3.29: Structure of Investment in Egyptian Industry, 1899 246
Table 3.30: Companies Containing Capital From Abroad, 1902 247
Table 3.31: Companies in Egypt - Paid-up Capital, 1902 247

Table 4.1: Greek Firms Established in Alexandria During the 1860s 278
Table 4.2: Leading Cotton-Exporting Firms in Alexandria, 1900 300
Table 4.3: Revenue from Tobacco Duties, 1884-1900 309
Note on Transliteration and Weights, Measures & Coins

Transliteration:

The system of transliteration used in this thesis is essentially that used by the Library of Congress.

Weights and Measures:

1 Kantar equals 43.93 Kgs. 1 oke equals 1.3 Kgs.
1 Fadden equals 1.038 acres

Coins:

1 Egyptian Pound equals 100 Egyptian Piasters

The following exchange rates were obtained in general during the period 1835 to 1900:

1 Austrian Thaler equaled 20 Egyptian Piasters
1 English Sovereign equaled 97% Egyptian Piasters
20 French Francs equaled 77.4 Egyptian Piasters
1 American Dollar equaled 19 Egyptian Piasters

INTRODUCTION

The development and dynamism of capitalist socio-economic and political forces during the last two centuries have constituted a primary focus for scholarly research among historians and social scientists. This has led to the emergence of a number of different theories and schools of socio-economic thought which reflect different political and ideological perspectives in the analysis of the global capitalist revolution. Furthermore, these theoretical and methodological approaches also exemplify different ways of conceptualising the relationship between national economies and the evolution and transformation of the global capitalist economy. It is, of course, beyond the scope of this introduction to attempt to present a critical survey of the many different theories in contention, or for that matter even a schematic outline of the main schools of thought.

The primary concern of this study, however, is an attempt to analyse the transformations experienced by one particular society, Egypt, during the nineteenth century in reference to the development of a capitalist global economy and the international division of labour. Thus, it is necessary to present in the first part of this introduction, albeit in a schematic form, some account of the different theoretical, conceptual and methodological frameworks employed by scholars in the analysis of the relationship between national economies in the periphery and the global capitalist economy. Though it is difficult to accomplish such a
task in a few pages, it is nevertheless necessary to at least outline
the wider intellectual arena from which is derived the particular
analytical framework employed in this study.

Furthermore, this thesis examines aspects of nineteenth century Egyptian
history via a focus on the Greek community of Alexandria, and in
particular some of the activities and role of certain prominent Greek
entrepreneurs. This poses immediately a methodological problem with
regard to the manner in which the Greek community in Alexandria and the
biographies of the Greek entrepreneurs will be conceptualised as
legitimate objects of historical analysis. This is particularly so
given that the primary concern of this thesis is an analysis of
transformations experienced by Egyptian society during the nineteenth
century, and the socio-economic history of the Greek community of
Alexandria which reflected only a particular manifestation of the wider
transformations experienced by the nation as a whole. Thus, it becomes
necessary to outline in the second part of this introduction the manner
in which a self-defined ideological object, the Greek community in
Alexandria, and the biographies of certain Greek entrepreneurs can
constitute appropriate units of analysis in an attempt to abstract
forces and processes that operated in the wider social formation.

Following the presentation of aspects of the theoretical approach that
will be employed in this study, it is necessary to suggest the specific
manner in which this will be translated into an operational analytical
framework. Thus, the third section of the introduction will outline the
substantive research from which is derived the particular historical
periodisation that is used in this study. Furthermore, an attempt will
be made in this section to outline the methodological argument that
underlies the particular choice of focus in this study, namely the Greek community in Alexandria.

The substantive aspect of this thesis, a study of the Greek community in Alexandria from 1830 to the end of the nineteenth century, represents a new contribution to the existing literature on modern Egyptian socio-economic history. This is due to its specific substantive focus. Nevertheless, there is a plethora of studies and research by Egyptian and non-Egyptian scholars on the various characteristics of the socio-economic transformations experienced by Egyptian society during the nineteenth century. This is both in reference to the internal changes and dynamics of Egyptian society and with regard to the nature of the relationship between Egyptian transformations and the development of the global capitalist economy. It is necessary, therefore, to locate the arguments and substantive material of this study within the wider framework of Egyptian nineteenth century historiography. Thus, the fourth part of this introduction will present an outline of some of the substantive studies which have focussed on Egyptian nineteenth century socio-economic history.
I. The Global Capitalist Economy: Theoretical Remarks

Capitalism as a new form of socio-economic organisation first emerged in Western Europe and subsequently appeared as though it radiated from there to encompass the rest of the globe by the end of the nineteenth century. It is not surprising, therefore, that much of the early scholarship which attempted to account for this new national and global socio-economic process reflected a West European bias and the interests of the early capitalists who were predominantly Europeans. Furthermore, much of this European scholarship which focused on diverse accounts of the capitalist revolution generally shared a conception of "...capitalism as the most rational and perfect form of society...the ideal summit of human evolution." (Szentes, 1988: 2) Thus, proponents of this Eurocentric apologia of capitalism focussed their research primarily on "...institutional, technical and social aspects of the industrial revolution" (Crouzet, 1972: 2) in Western Europe and avoided any systematic discussion of contradictions, developing social inequality, the increasing exploitation of labour, or, for that matter, the effects of European capitalism on the rest of the globe.²

Due to the development of capitalism on a global scale, this early scholarship, which is still generally accepted as the universal account of capitalist history and dynamics, "...replaced other pre-capitalist economic ideas and made the development of economic theories later or in other countries more or less derivative...and forced all others to relate to it, either as followers or opponents." (Szentes, 1988: 8) Thus, it is not surprising that the work of Karl Marx and other early Marxists, which emerged primarily in order to deal with the 'victims' of Western capitalism, had little influence on this classical European school.³ Neither did the work of other Marxist-oriented economic and
social historians such as Eric Williams. In fact, Williams' contentions, as delineated in his pioneering study, *Capitalism and Slavery* (1944), that a large part of the capital which financed the industrial revolution in Britain came from the profits of the slave trade have continued to be dismissed by most conventional European scholars as just "another alluring but unfounded and misleading hypothesis...which at best was based on a few random and unrepresentative examples of West India merchants having become bankers and manufacturers." (Crouzet, 1972: 7-8)

In distinct contrast to the prevalent European account of capitalist expansion which is rooted in classical economic theory, some European scholars perceived capitalism as "...an objective necessity deriving from the general tendencies of social development [and]...a particular phase...in the general development of human society." (Szentes, 1988: 2)

Furthermore, for these scholars,

*Capitalism, whose emergence and operation presupposed from the outset a wider scope and sphere of activity than its immediate product, national economies, was the first system in history to bring about a world economy. The capitalist world economy involves relations of dominance and asymmetric dependence between its centre and its periphery. (Szentes, 1988: 3)*

Thus, the proponents of what may be termed the Marxist political economy approach attempted to examine the manner in which the forces unleashed by this capitalist revolution conditioned and structured not only West European societies, but also global history. Eric Hobsbawm, a leading proponent of this school, underscored the global implications of capitalism in his classic work, *The Age of Revolution*, (1973) when he noted:

*Indeed its most striking consequence for world history was to establish a domination of the globe by a few western régimes (and especially by the British) which has no parallel in history. Before the merchants, the steam-engines, the ships and the guns of the west - and before its ideas - the age-old*
civilizations and empires of the world capitulated and collapsed. India became a province administered by British pro-consuls, the Islamic states were convulsed by crisis, Africa lay open to direct conquest. Even the great Chinese Empire was forced in 1839-42 to open its frontiers to western exploitation. By 1848 nothing stood in the way of western conquest of any territory that western governments or businessmen might find it to their advantage to occupy, just as nothing but time stood in the way of progress of western capitalist enterprise. (Hobsbawm, 1973: 15-6)

Nevertheless, whereas scholars such as Hobsbawm acknowledged the global dimensions of capitalist development and triumph and in fact concentrated their research efforts on an attempt to outline the precise mechanisms of this global capitalist expansion, their methodological perspective retained the Eurocentrism of the classical school. Eric Hobsbawm, for example, justified such an approach by noting that "if its perspective is primarily European, or more precisely, Franco-British, it is because in this period the world - or at least a large part of it - was transformed from a European, or rather a Franco-British, base." (Hobsbawm, 1973: 11) The survival of the Eurocentric approach, within the analytical framework of the Marxist political economy school, however, does not derive solely from a substantive argument such as that presented by Hobsbawm. It also derives from the on-going theoretical and conceptual debates within critical political economy with regard to the characterisation of centre-periphery relations and specifically the conceptualisation of Imperialism. Let me elaborate.

The conceptualisation of relations between advanced, industrialised capitalist nations and the majority of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America has constituted a major preoccupation of many scholars, notwithstanding their theoretical or conceptual approach. As Bill Warren points out, however, "the great bulk of this literature, [studies related to Imperialism],...owes much of its intellectual inspiration to
Marxist work." (Warren, 1980: 3) Central to the study of Imperialism is an analysis of the specific relations between different capitalist and non-capitalist societies and of capitalism as a world economic system. Marx, however, contributed primarily to our understanding of European history and to the analysis of the capitalist mode of production. It is for this reason that Marxist theorists of Imperialism in their substantive contributions have differed widely while claiming to represent the 'true' Marx.\(^4\)

It is beyond the scope of this introduction to attempt to resolve this continuing debate or for that matter to present an adequate account of the various issues. At a general level, however, it is possible to suggest that this Marxist body of literature can be sub-divided into two main categories. "There are those that concentrate on the progressive role of capitalism in developing the forces of production, and conversely those that present capitalism as a system of exploitation of one area by another." (Brewer, 1980: 15-6) Furthermore, these two Marxist interpretations of Imperialism also present two distinct Marxist accounts of the world economy and the international division of labour. Relying on the assumption that capitalism subsumes all other non-capitalist forms and modes of production, the first category of scholars advocates the emergence of a unitary global capitalist economy where capitalist relations of production are generalised.\(^5\) The second category of Marxist scholars suggest the possibility of differential relations between capitalism and non-capitalist forms and modes of production, and thus argue for a global capitalist economy which is characterised by an articulation of capitalist and non-capitalist forms and modes of production.\(^6\)
In general it is possible to suggest that the proponents of the "generalised capitalist production" thesis tend to view the centres of capitalist development and accumulation as constituting the focal points of scholarly research because it is there that the dynamics and logic of global capitalism are conditioned and structured. Thus, Eric Hobsbawm, a proponent of this Marxist approach, devotes preponderant attention to Western Europe in his analysis of the triumph of global capitalism, "...since the world revolution spread outwards from the double crater of England and France [and] it initially took the form of a European expansion in and conquest of the rest of the world." (Hobsbawm, 1973: 15) This approach, however, also characterises the methodological framework of another group of Marxist scholars, who in distinct contrast to Hobsbawm, claim to have shed the Eurocentric bias of classical Marxism, but as it will be argued below remain within the confines of the "generalised capitalist production" school of Marxism. Paul Baran, Paul Sweezy, Andre Gunder Frank, and the Dependency school, to mention but a few examples, claim to conceptualise the global capitalist economy in terms of "unequal development", but in effect exemplify a unilinear and non-dialectical account of the dynamics of global capitalism. Let me elaborate.

Baran, Sweezy and Frank, who in many respects constitute the theoretical gurus of the Dependency school, have produced a plethora of studies which cannot be adequately summarised here. Nevertheless, it is possible to present an outline of the main thrust of their arguments. By far the most important limitation of their work is their failure to grasp the significance of the differential relationship between the different peripheral economies and the global capitalist economy. As John Taylor points out, "for the Underdevelopment theorists...these
different effects tend to remain unanalysed, since their specificity is less important than their overall cause." (Taylor, 1979: 77) This generalised approach to the study of peripheral economies is underscored by Frank, when he notes that

One and the same historical process of the expansion and development of capitalism throughout the world has simultaneously generated - and continues to generate - both economic development and structural underdevelopment. (Frank, 1967: 13)

Furthermore, this unilinear social and economic determinism that characterises the methodological approach of these theorists highlights its inadequacy by the manner in which they conceptualise the protagonist in the process of underdevelopment in the periphery, namely capitalism and the global capitalist economy. For Frank the global capitalist economy and capitalism are one and the same thing since by capitalism, "...Frank means a system in which the surplus product is appropriated by non-producers in a process of producing commodities for the market." (Taylor, 1979: 88) Such a conceptualisation of capitalism and the global capitalist economy, of course, is but a highly simplified and derived version of European classical political economy. Thus, the study of the global capitalist economy by Baran, Sweezy, Frank and the Dependency school fails to grasp the dialectical relationship between it and the national economies in the periphery. Instead, they reproduce, both at a methodological and substantive level, the abstractions of "generalised capitalist production" which characterises much of classical Marxist scholarship and its implicit Eurocentrism.

Tamás Szentes, however, who exemplifies the second category of Marxist scholars, notes that

*a natural concomitant of the operation of a world capitalist economy has been unequal development...While capitalism has created and developed national economies in the central or core countries, it has prevented the countries of the periphery from*
developing their own national economies. Since the very birth of capitalism, therefore, a dialectical contradiction has appeared between national and international development, which capitalism has been unable to resolve. (Szentes, 1988: 4)

As was indicated above, however, some of the proponents of the "unequal development" thesis have failed to translate the above conceptual approach into an operational methodological framework. Thus, whereas they recognise the analytical significance of the periphery in a study of the development of global capitalism, and are concerned to avoid the pitfalls of Eurocentrism, their analysis of the dynamics and transformations occurring in the non-European world is in effect both Eurocentric and derivative. This is because, at a methodological level, they regard all socio-economic processes in the periphery as being related directly to the global capitalist economy, whose dynamics they ultimately derive from the specific histories of West European nations. This is clearly the case with Baran, Sweezy, Frank and the Dependency school, who exemplify one variant of the "unequal development" school. By focussing almost exclusively on international exchange relations and neglecting the analytical significance of contradictions and developments inherent in national economies and societies in the periphery, such scholars produce accounts which are not only Eurocentric, but are also closer to classical and neo-classical economic theory than Marxist scholarship.

Immanuel Wallerstein (1974) and the "world systems" theorists, who also belong to the "generalised capitalist production" school of Marxism, have attempted to improve upon the "unequal development" thesis. Thus, they conceptualise the capitalist global economy as

a single capitalist unit with an all-embracing division of labour and exchange between core states, the periphery and the semi-periphery, and accompanied by a multiplicity of separate political and cultural units, i.e. nation states. National economies do not exist, nor are societies really national.
Even social classes are only 'classes of the world economy'... What actually determines the core, periphery or semi-periphery status of individual countries is, in the last analysis, the strength of their state power, which is the main weapon available to achieve a more favourable allocation of role and share of income in the integrated world economy. (Szentes, 1988: 28)

For the "world systems" theorists, who have dissolved, conceptually at least, all national economies in favour of a 'single, unitary global capitalist economy, "unequal development" is derived solely from the antagonistic relations between strong and weak political states. At first, this approach to the study of the capitalist global economy appears to remove the Eurocentric bias inherent in other Marxist theories, by virtue of the fact that it draws a clear conceptual distinction between national cultural and political entities and the global economic system. Given, however, that the political antagonisms between states, be they of the core, periphery or semi-periphery, constitute a subjective dimension in the analysis, the conceptualisation of the dynamics of the global capitalist economy have to be derived from an essentialist model of capitalism. This essentialist model of capitalism, of course, is abstracted from the particular histories of the early capitalist states, namely Western Europe. This is due to the fact that the dialectical relationship between the whole and its parts - the national economies and the global capitalist economy - and also between the socio-economic and political structures has been dismissed from both the methodological and substantive agenda. Thus, Wallerstein and the "world systems" theorists ultimately present a generalised account of the global capitalist economy which exemplifies, conceptually at least, a Eurocentric bias.

It can be concluded from the preceding discussion that Wallerstein and the other theorists discussed above share the assumption that it is
possible to distinguish methodologically between the logic of a social system - which is subordinate and needs to be realised - and its origins and historical evolution - which is dominant and explicit. Such a methodological approach takes us away from historical materialism and back to functionalist empiricism where "history is concerned with changes, ethnology with structures - and this because changes, or processes, are conceived not as analytical objects but as the particular way in which a temporality is experienced by a subject." (Godelier, 1972: xxxvi-xxxvii) Such a view, however, which sustains the diachrony-synchrony distinction is incompatible with Marx's view of historical time and historical materialism. This conceptual separation between history and society, of course, is unable to grasp the dialectical relationship between the formation and development of parts of the global economy and the developing structures of determination within it. Thus, it is possible to suggest that the major inadequacy, shared by all the theories presented above, is derived from their failure to translate historical materialism into an operational methodological framework for the analysis of the dynamics of the global capitalist economy.

Tamás Szentes is one Marxist scholar who has attempted to formulate an operational analytical framework which consists of "...two, equally primary and dialectical inter-related units or levels of analysis, namely the world and national units." (Szentes, 1988: 29) For as he points out,

*Socio-economic development has been going ahead both at the level of nations, i.e. within countries, and on the world level. Consequently, it is not sufficient to have a single unit of analysis...The existence and relevance of national economies and societies have not disappeared yet, and in fact cannot fade away as long as the national character of the political superstructure of the state and its institutions survives...On the other hand,...a world level analysis helps to understand many new, specific problems. It is also, of course, a pre-requisite for understanding the unequal development of the world capitalist system, centre-periphery relations, and*
the causes of the underdevelopment of the Third World. (Szentes, 1988: 4)

Thus, it is possible to conclude from Szentes' work that in a critical analysis of the global capitalist economy, "...the appropriate unit of its analysis is neither exclusively the national nor the world system." (Szentes, 1988: 4) Instead, it is the dialectical relationship between national and global socio-economic forces and developments which should constitute the methodological framework within which the global expansion of capitalism is analysed. It is hoped, of course, that such a dialectical approach to the study of the global capitalism economy can avoid both the pitfalls of Eurocentrism and the generalisations inherent in deriving the diverse histories of the periphery from a unitary and evolutionary conceptualisation of global capitalism.
II. Biography and Community: Legitimate Objects of Historical Analysis

In many respects the methodological issues involved in the study of any community are quite similar to those discussed above with regard to the relationship between national economies and the capitalist global economy. On the one hand, communities, no matter how they are perceived or defined, constitute part of a larger social reality and are therefore conditioned and structured by the dynamics of this wider social system. On the other hand, communities represent "...a state of society based on primary solidarities of kinship, tribe, patronage and other forms of traditional obligations and bonds." (Zubaida, 1986: 1) The primary solidarities that characterise communities, however, also constitute important forces in determining and structuring the wider social system. Thus, it is necessary to adopt a methodological framework which permits the dialectical relationship between community and the wider social system to be abstracted for the purpose of historical analysis.

This is a particularly important, but problematic task. Three different types of scholarly debate underlay the issues involved in constructing such a methodological framework: first, the artificial division of labour between historians and sociologists with regard to what constitutes a legitimate object of study; second, the problematic area, common to both historians and social scientists, of how to relate the part to the wider social system; and third, the distinction between class and community as alternative bases of social solidarity. It is, of course, beyond the scope of this introduction to attempt to either resolve these classic debates or for that matter to present an adequate synopsis of the main arguments. Nevertheless, given the particular
concern of this thesis, it is necessary to present in a brief form the approach that is being used in this study.

The first two types of debate reflect a fundamental division between functionalist empiricism and structuralism, on the one hand, and historical materialism on the other. (Asad, 1974; Seddon, 1978) It is, of course, a division between scholars who accept the diachrony-synchrony distinction and those who reject it. As Philip Abrams has pointed out in his classic contribution *Historical Sociology* (1982), those scholars who accept such a methodological distinction also permit it to be the primary determinant in the division of labour between history and sociology. In fact, such scholarship also highlights the crucial difference between structuralism and historical materialism. For as Jarius Banaji has pointed out, "structuralism has based its resistance to the incursions of time in a dualist theory of (sociological) knowledge, separating historical and structural analysis, and assigning to each a discrete sector of reality." (Banaji, 1970: 84) Sociologists and social anthropologists, for example, who concentrate their research efforts on 'realising' the underlying logic or forces that hold social units together, tend to neglect both history and the wider social system within which their unit of analysis is embedded and evolves historically. Historians, on the other hand, who concentrate their research on an analysis of events and changes in their unit of analysis tend to neglect the social context. Abrams, however, argues that

> at the end of the debate the diachrony-synchrony distinction is absurd. Sociology must be concerned with eventuation, because that is how structuring happens. History must be theoretical, because that is how structuring is apprehended. History has no privileged access to the empirical evidence relevant to the common explanatory project. And sociology has no privileged theoretical access. (Abrams, 1982: x-xi)
Thus, it is possible to conclude that an appropriate methodological framework would highlight the dialectical relationship between the subjective or ideologically-defined characteristics of a community and the historical evolution of the wider social system. The community must be analysed, as it were, on its own terms, but it is equally important to consider the manner in which the historical evolution of the wider social system modified these terms. The history of the community, therefore, is abstracted from the dialectic of the historical evolution of the subjective meanings attached to the community and the historical transformation of the objective forces which structure the wider social system. (Fleischer, 1973: 38-63) Of course, neither conventional sociology nor social anthropology, or for that matter classical historiography can contribute to such a methodological approach. (Glavanis and Glavanis, 1983: 4-9) Instead, such an approach needs to be derived from the logic of historical materialism which suggests that the socio-economic and cultural relations of a particular community have to be derived from an understanding of the location of these relations within the total structure of relations which comprise the community.

It is now possible to turn to the third debate mentioned above. This is a classic debate which has characterised socio-economic and historical scholarship for some time, and it revolves around the manner in which scholars draw an analytical distinction between community and class in the study of social formations. Some scholars, such as Sami Zubaida (1986: 1), have argued that "this distinction is in origin an evolutionary assumption, part of the classic evolutionary dichotomies, such as 'status' to 'contract', 'mechanical' to 'organic' solidarities, *gemeinschaft* to *gesellschaft*". Furthermore, Zubaida has gone on to argue that "these are schematic, 'ideal typical' characterisations; when
it comes to the study of concrete, historical societies, these different
types coexist in more or less complex patterns." In many respects this
debate is similar to a fundamental distinction drawn by Marxists
scholars who focus their research on imperialism and its effects on
peripheral social formations. This Marxist debate, which was discussed
briefly in the previous section, counterposes two analytical
assumptions; the possibility of capitalism subsuming all non-capitalist
forms to the possibility of differential relations between them. It is
the evolutionary logic that underlies the work of the Marxist proponents
of "generalised capitalist production" that constitutes the point of
contact between the two debates. For as Sami Zubaida argues,

Strictly evolutionary logic, whether Marxist or modernisation
theory, would conclude that with capitalism or modernisation
the second form of the couple (class) must emerge, and with it
secondary bases of association and solidarity, including
classes, political parties and trade unions...The persistence
of some of the old bases of primary solidarity or their
transformation in modern forms, such as political parties,
would be seen as transitional forms, survivals, failure of the
full evolutionary process because of traditional sentiments or
uneven development or reactive and distorted forms of
capitalist development resulting from dependency, all depending
on the theoretical position. (Zubaida. 1986: 1)

This approach to the study of peripheral societies, of course, is
identical to the methodological orientation of such scholars as Baran,
Sweezy, Frank and Wallerstein. Just as national economies are
conceptually subsumed into the dynamics and logic of the global
capitalist economy, so the socio-cultural specificity (primary
solidarities) of peripheral societies is conceptually dissolved in
favour of secondary and universal forms of solidarity. The a-historical
and non-dialectic aspects of this structuralist approach, however, take
us back to functionalist empiricism, albeit with analytical priority
being given to alternative forms of social solidarity. Whereas
functionalist sociology and social anthropology argue for the analytical
priority of kinship, tribe, and other forms of primary solidarity, this approach rejects such bases for determining social structures in favour of class and other forms of impersonal solidarity. The simple replacement, however, of one ideal-

typical category by another does not enhance our ability to grasp the dynamics of either peripheral societies or for that matter of global capitalism.

Many scholars who concentrate their research on peripheral societies, however, "...have had to face the fact that solidarities and political alignments and forces cannot be explained simply or primarily in terms of class and related concepts." (Zubaida, 1986: 2) It is necessary, therefore, to formulate a methodological framework which gives equal analytical priority to both the primary and secondary forms of social solidarity. For as Zubaida points out, what is important "...is not so much the persistence of old forms of primary solidarities as their political and ideological reconstructions in relation to the new situations." (Zubaida, 1986: 2)

It is in this respect that historical materialism can make a contribution to an area of socio-historical research where functionalism and structuralism have failed. For historical materialism does not conceive of the relationship between capitalism and other non-capitalist forms and modes of production

as a succession or evolution (as in the 'stages' model: primitive communal, ancient, slave, feudal and capitalist modes of production, with the 'Asiatic' awkwardly at a tangent); nor yet as some kind of dialectical transcendence and dissolution...; nor even as a transition (unless prolonged to the point of analytical vacuity). On the contrary, capitalism neither evolves mechanically from what precedes it, nor does it necessarily dissolve it; indeed so far from banishing pre-capitalist forms, it not only coexists with them but buttresses them, and even on occasions devilishly conjures them up ex nihilo. (Foster-Carter, 1978: 213)
In fact, historical materialism perceives of non-capitalist socio-economic and political relations as being undermined and perpetuated at one and the same time, and argues for complex forms of dissolution and conservation of these primary solidarities in the context of the expansion of global capitalism. (Foster-Carter, 1978) It is ironic, therefore, that scholars who claim to be guided by a Marxist methodological framework, which highlights dialectical and contradictory relations, should advocate an analytical approach that relies upon an evolutionary logic. Thus, it is necessary to agree with Harriet Friedmann when she notes that "those of us who have criticized the underdevelopment literature must insist on bringing back its central insight, which has been lost in its evolution into a theory of the 'capitalist world-system'. Underdevelopment creates specific structures, different from capitalism and from each other." (Friedmann, 1986: 121)

The contradictory and dialectical development of global capitalism has given rise to many nationalist movements in the periphery, and in the post-WWII period these movements culminated in the establishment of nationalist regimes in most peripheral societies. The political and ideological alignments in these societies have also contributed to the emergence of an indigenous scholarship whose primary concern is the analysis of relations between peripheral societies and global capitalism. (Glavanis and Glavanis, 1983: 9-20) It is not surprising, therefore, that many of the scholars from peripheral societies would engage actively in such debates as the one being discussed here. Given the political and ideological alignments in these countries, however, the contributions of these scholars have added a new dimension to the
debate which has in fact contributed to its further polarisation. Let me elaborate.

Despite the conceptual and methodological inadequacies of structuralism that were discussed briefly above, one of its major contributions was that it undermined functionalist sociology and social anthropology. This was especially the case with regard to studies and research that focussed on peripheral societies. Thus, classical social anthropology which gave analytical priority to kinship, tribe and other primary forms of social solidarity experienced a serious setback. (Asad, 1973a) In some respects, however, its essentialist methodological approach has experienced a revival in the scholarly production from peripheral societies. This is in addition to the fact that this literature has also contributed to an artificial polarisation of the debate in terms of Western versus Third World scholarship. This is due to the fact that the bulk of this literature tends to be primarily concerned with

...the idea of a cultural heritage which does not admit class divisions and factional ideologies, but insists on the unity and solidarity of the community-cum-nation. Cultural nationalists from 'negritude' theorists to Muslim Brothers have advanced some version of this ideology. But, naturally, contrary to their Western counterparts, Third World essentialists reject the idea of tribal or ethnic divisions. (Zubaida, 1986: 1-2)

Arguing primarily against modernisation theory and certain forms of vulgar Marxism which gave analytical priority to secondary and impersonal forms of social solidarity, this Third World cultural essentialism has "...rejected the evolutionary schemes in favour of cultural continuities. [Its] line of argument contends that Western political thought and organisation are culturally specific, and as such alien to African and Asian cultures." (Zubaida, 1986: 1) Nevertheless,
it is possible to suggest that the new form taken by this debate, and especially the acute ethnic and geopolitical polarisation among scholars, detracts rather than contributes to any endeavour to develop the appropriate methodological framework for the socio-historical study of either peripheral societies or global capitalism. Thus, it is possible to conclude that historical materialism, despite its limitations when translated into an operational analytical framework, still constitutes the most appropriate conceptual structure within which the dynamics and historical evolution of communities can be grasped. This is particularly so since it is also a conceptual framework

...which recognises simultaneously and in equal measure that history and society are made by constant and more or less purposeful individual action and that individual action, however purposeful, is made by history and society. (Abrams, 1982: xiii)

This, of course, is a central issue with regard to the particular focus of this study. The Greek community in Alexandria consisted of individuals who at one and the same time were actors in the arena of Egyptian historical transformation and the specific activities of their own self-defined ethnic community. In order to grasp, therefore, this duality, this study presents a number of biographies of prominent Greeks from the Alexandria community. Thus, it is also necessary to ensure that the use of biography as a form of writing socio-economic history is compatible with the logic of the historical materialist analytical framework being used in this study. In fact, it is necessary to approach the biographies from a perspective which combines the historical and sociological method and exemplifies C. Wright Mills' (1970: 159) argument that the "coordinate points in the proper study of man" are the problems "of biography, of history and of their intersections within social structures."
Following from the above discussion it is possible to conclude that it is necessary to construct a methodological framework which allows the complexities and dialectics of historical transformation to be grasped. To translate such an analytical framework into a substantive study of a particular community or society, however, is not an easy task. This is due to the fact that it is necessary for at least three different types of analysis to be carried out simultaneously and in a dialectical framework. The three different types are: first, the relationship between individual and collective actors and the social unit within which they operate; second, the relationship between the community and the wider social system; and third, the relationship between the social system and the global capitalist structure. It is hoped that this study will make an attempt to combine these three different styles of interpretation into a single methodological framework.
III. Historical Contextualisation: Methodological Remarks

The nineteenth century economic history of Egypt was characterised by the rapid transformation of a subsistence economy into a fully developed export-oriented economy. This transformation essentially took place during the reign of Muhammad 'Ali (1805-1848) who was concerned to modernise and strengthen the Egyptian state and thus promoted actively the cultivation and export of cotton. Similar to the theoretical work of European mercantilists, Muhammad 'Ali also saw exports as an important means of achieving a favourable balance of trade as well as increasing the tax base and economic power of the Egyptian state. The successful implementation of such an economic policy also necessitated Egypt's integration into the expanding global capitalist market and international division of labour.

Until the 1860s, the Egyptian state was able to keep the activities of the European entrepreneurs under control and maintained both a positive balance of trade and a relatively successful policy of self-determination. Following the end of the American Civil War and the rapid drop in cotton prices in the international markets, however, European commercial and financial capital invaded the Egyptian economy en masse. Egypt was rapidly transformed into a dependent cotton plantation and with the 1882 British military occupation, its full peripheral and dependent status was confirmed. Thus, it is possible to conclude that Egyptian nineteenth century economic history is closely related to the developments of the global capitalist economy. In order to grasp, therefore, the specificities of Egyptian transformation, it is necessary first to outline the characteristics of global capitalist developments.
As indicated in the first section of this introduction, there are a number of different and competing interpretations of the historical development of the global capitalist economy. Even among Marxist scholars there are important debates as to the origins and dynamics of the global capitalist economy. As Tamás Szentes points out,

They [Marxists] also have differences of view as to the component forces and sources of cohesion in the world economy. The role of colonization and regular commodity exchange based on a structured division of labour among countries may be acknowledged in general. But the effects of the rise and fall of the colonial system on the capitalist world market are viewed differently, and so are the forces which have shaped the division of labour. While the unequal relationship between the metropolitan, developed capitalist (imperialist) centre and its underdeveloped (colonized) periphery is almost unanimously stressed by all Marxists, there is no consensus on how this centre-periphery relationship may have changed or what periods in its development can be distinguished. (Szentes, 1988: 33)

It is clearly beyond the scope of this section of the introduction to attempt to resolve the on-going Marxist debates or for that matter to present a synopsis of all the major arguments. In many respects, however, the interpretation proposed by Tamás Szentes in his work, *The Transformation of the World Economy: New Directions and New Interests* (1988), is quite similar to that which underlies the substantive analysis in this study. Thus, it is necessary at least to outline the main aspects of the Szentes interpretation of the global capitalist economy.

Szentes' main argument revolves around the thesis that

*Capitalism has evolved unevenly on both a national and a world level...As a result, the stages of capitalist development within particular countries, even in the pioneer ones, have neither necessarily preceded nor perfectly coincided with the development stages of capitalism internationally...As a consequence uneven development has become a general law of capitalism. This makes any historical periodization of capitalist development not simply difficult but even contradictory.* (Szentes, 1988: 33-4)
It is clear from the above that Szentes rejects the evolutionary or unilinear concept of capitalist development. In fact, as he points out, "had capitalism developed only as a national system in each country, independently of each other and with no centre-periphery relationship, the linear concept of development would have applied and a classic sequence of stages could have been distinguished in each case." (Szentes, 1988: 34) Capitalism, of course, did not develop solely as a national system, and centre-periphery relations are a major characteristic of the global capitalist economy even in non-Marxist scholarship. Thus, in any attempt to present a periodisation of capitalist development, it is necessary "...to take into account both the stages through which national capitalisms have gone and the structural changes, related to the former, in centre-periphery relations." (Szentes, 1988: 35) On the basis of such an approach, Szentes proposes the following four stages as characterising the development of the global capitalist economy:

1. The stage of mercantilism and early colonialism.
2. The stage of the rise of a colonial division of labour between the competitive, classical industrial capitalism of the centre and the colonized economies of the periphery adjusting to the demands of the centre.
3. The stage of monopoly capitalist empires, each with its own internal bilateral relations with its colonies and capital mobility, reinforcing the dichotomous pattern of the world economy.
4. The stage of multilateralizing international economic relations of state monopoly capitalism, which gives birth by means of redeployment and transnational corporations to a neo-colonial division of labour between the centre and the periphery, and deepening asymmetrical interdependencies within a global mixed economy. (Szentes, 1988: 35)

Following the above periodisation of the global capitalist economy, it is now possible to point out that an analytical study of Egyptian nineteenth century socio-economic and political developments suggests a
historical convergence with the second and third stages. Let me elaborate.

According to Szentes, the second stage was primarily characterised by the fact that "international trade took on a more and more structured character. And the outlines of an international division of labour appeared...And the first attempts were witnessed in the periphery to develop an imitative capitalism, particularly with the political success of anti-colonial liberation struggles in the American continent." (Szentes, 1988: 40) As later chapters will show, this stage of the development of the global capitalist economy coincides with three important developments within the Egyptian social formation: first, the rapid modernisation of the national economy through the accelerated production and export of cotton; second, Egypt's integration into the international market primarily as a supplier of one agricultural commodity; and third, the effective political struggle of the Egyptian state in order to achieve independence from the Ottoman Empire.

As to the third stage in the development of the global capitalist economy, it was characterised by two important factors: first, the manner in which "the political, administrative and military structure of colonialism...affected the further development of the periphery countries", (Szentes, 1988: 49-50) and second, the way in which "foreign private capital...penetrated sheltered territories and built up or took over the key export sectors." (Szentes, 1988: 50) Once more this study will indicate that the third stage in the development of the global capitalist economy also coincides with two major developments within Egyptian society: first, Egypt's loss of administrative, economic and political independence following the imposition of European control over her economy in 1876 and especially after the British occupation of 1882;
and second, her rapid transformation into a dependent economy where European (primarily British and French) capital excercised effective control over all commercial and financial structures and enterprises. Furthermore, as Szentes points out, due to "...the privileged, monopolistic position of metropolitan capital vis-à-vis any local or outside rivals in the colonized periphery, competition was practically eliminated, technological development impeded, and investment policy directly subordinated to the interests of the metropolitan economy." (Szentes, 1988: 50) This is a particularly important characteristic of the third stage in the development of the global capitalist economy, especially when it is related to the primary focus of this study, namely the role of the Greeks in Alexandria. Let me elaborate.

The substantive chapters of this study will argue that Greek entrepreneurs from Alexandria played a pioneering and dominant role in the commercial and financial sectors of the Egyptian economy throughout the nineteenth century. Furthermore, the study will suggest that in the absence of Egyptian entrepreneurs, these Greek merchants and financiers could in fact be perceived as the primary form of indigenous participation in the commercial and financial structures and enterprises of the national economy. Nevertheless, an analytical discussion of their socio-economic and political activities highlights an important transformation in their economic orientation and ideological characteristics. The Greek entrepreneurs, who determined both the developments of the Greek community and the commercial and financial sectors of the Egyptian economy until 1882, in many respects represented Egyptian rather than European interests and participated in the national economy either as individuals or as representatives of local and regional (eastern Mediterranean) commercial capital. Subsequent to the
British occupation they were replaced by a different group of Greek entrepreneurs, also from Alexandria, who also played a pioneering and dominant role both within the Greek community and at the level of the national economy. An analytical discussion of the activities of the latter group, however, suggests that they acted primarily as agents of European finance capital. Thus, it is possible to argue that the transformation of Egyptian society during the nineteenth century, albeit as reflected in the activities of the Greek entrepreneurs from Alexandria, exemplified specific developments that converged with the general patterns that characterised the changes experienced by the global capitalist economy during its third stage.

In concluding this brief discussion of Tamás Szentes' periodisation of the development of the global capitalist economy, it is possible to suggest two general observations. First, the transformations experienced by Egyptian society at the national economic and political levels during the nineteenth century converged in many respects with the general characteristics of the second and third stages in the development of the global capitalist economy. Second, the specific transformations experienced by the Greek community in Alexandria during the same historical period also converged with the general patterns that characterised these two stages of global capitalist development. Of course, such a conclusion needs to be substantiated and this is the primary concern of the rest of the study.

Prior to concluding this argument, it is necessary to draw attention to a methodological issue which emerges from the above presentation and also constitutes a central factor in determining the style of the analysis in the following chapters. It has been indicated above that the transformations experienced by Egyptian society during the
nineteenth century paralleled in some respects two particular stages in the development of the global capitalist economy. What has not been identified and discussed, however, is the particular forces and mechanisms which played the role of linking Egyptian transformations to the general trends occurring at the global level. The export of Egyptian cotton to the international markets, of course, represented a very obvious and direct link between the Egyptian and international economies. But cotton exports in themselves cannot account or explain the historical fact that Egypt embarked on a successful path of rapid economic modernisation and development during the first half of the nineteenth century and three decades later had lost her sovereignty and exemplified a fully developed dependent economy.

It is possible to suggest, therefore, that it is necessary to abstract analytically the particular forces which were able to play the dual role of initiating the development and underdevelopment of Egyptian society during the nineteenth century. As Caglar Keyder has pointed out,

while agriculture and industry are the receiving media upon which the patterns of integration (in the global capitalist economy) are imposed, the discussion of trade, and money and banking seek to describe the structuring forces. In other words, trade and credit are the mechanisms which transmit and implement the requirements of the world economy to the peripheral formation... (Thus) merchant and interest-bearing capital are forces which ensure the peripheral structuring of the productive forces employed in agriculture and industry. (Keyder, 1981: 5-6)

Keyder's argument is premised on the fact that both merchant and interest-bearing capital are capable of operating in different socio-economic systems - capitalist and non-capitalist social formations - and thus can act as intermediaries between any particular peripheral society and the global capitalist economy. In fact, this study will argue that merchant and interest-bearing capital - what Marx called the twin
brothers - played a leading role in Egyptian economic history throughout the nineteenth century. In other words, merchant and interest-bearing capital were prominent during both periods of rapid economic modernisation and the development of underdevelopment and loss of sovereignty. Thus, it is possible to suggest that these two forms of capital ought to constitute a focal point for an analysis which attempts to abstract the specificity of Egyptian historical transformations and the dialectical relationship between them and the development of the global capitalist economy. As this study will attempt to show, however, in the case of Egypt during the nineteenth century, this necessitates a particular focus on the activities of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria. It is possible to conclude, therefore, that this presentation of the specific methodological framework employed in this study has also outlined the conceptual framework within which was formulated its particular problematic and focus, namely aspects of the role and activities of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria during the nineteenth century.

It is important to note at this point that this particular problematic also derives from a critical examination of Middle East and Ottoman historiography which has devoted considerable attention to the role and activities of the various non-Muslim minority communities. This is especially the case with regard to their role in the process of the incorporation of the Ottoman Empire into the global capitalist economy during the nineteenth century. In general, these minority communities appear in the literature "...as the embodiment of market rationality, and hence as agents of social change, their role being akin to that of a 'cushion' or a 'filter' through which modernization makes
its debut and permeates the entire social fabric." (Tabak, 1988: 179)

Furthermore, when discussing the role of these non-Muslim communities,

Ottoman historiography makes two assumptions: First, it is generally thought that these non-Muslim intermediaries rose to wealth and prominence as a direct consequence of their collaboration with foreign capitalists. The second assumption is that, underlying this collaboration, there was a continuous harmony of interests between foreigners and local non-Muslim intermediaries. On the basis of these two assumptions, non-Muslim intermediaries of the Ottoman Empire are frequently likened to the comprador classes of Latin America. In other words, they are thought of as having functioned as a staging post for the implantation and reproduction of foreign capital in the Ottoman Empire. (Kasaba, 1988: 216)

With reference to the discussion of the conceptual and methodological issues related to the study of community in the previous section of the introduction, it is possible to suggest that the above characterisation of non-Muslim communities in the Ottoman Empire exemplifies a functionalist and essentialist analytical framework. The analysis is functionalist in that it fails to consider the possibility of evolving contradictions that may have characterised the relations between non-Muslim communities in the Ottoman Empire and European entrepreneurs seeking new markets in the periphery. Instead, it posits a priori a methodological identification and harmony between the non-Muslim communities in the Ottoman Empire and the European merchants. An identification, it might be added, which is derived solely from an essentialist conceptualisation of the non-Muslim communities - Christians and Jews - which identifies them with the Judeo-Christian culture of Europe and contrasts them to the Islamic civilisation prevailing in the Ottoman Empire. (14)

Furthermore, the non-Muslim communities are seen as social units which exemplify no internal socio-economic and political differentiation. In this respect, this type of conceptualisation of community highlights the
analytical priority of primary forms of solidarity - kinship, tribe, religion, etc. - to the exclusion of any secondary forms which may have emerged during the process of transformation of the Ottoman Empire during the nineteenth century. (Owen, 1975) Thus, it is possible to suggest that this type of community analysis differs conceptually from the evolutionary logic of some Marxist and modernisation scholars who juxtapose primary and secondary forms of social solidarity. In distinct contrast, this conceptualisation can be identified with the traditional cultural essentialists - functionalist social anthropology - who juxtapose different forms of primary solidarity in an analysis of transformations experienced by peripheral societies.

It is not surprising, therefore, that this type of analysis is also characterised by a pronounced form of Eurocentrism. This is confirmed by the fact that non-Muslim communities were seen primarily as the 'agents' of European civilisation whose role was central in the transmission of the so-called progressive and democratic ideals of Western capitalism which were assumed to be responsible for the initiation of the modernisation process in the Ottoman Empire. (Glavanis, 1975) Of course, it is needless to add that such an approach also ignores conceptually and in practice the unequal development of the global capitalist economy and the dialectical nature of centre-periphery relations which contributed to the development of underdevelopment in the latter. This is in addition to the fact that such an analysis idealises capitalist development in the West and ignores - conceptually and substantively - the important forms of socio-economic and political differentiation that characterised the nineteenth century industrialisation process in European societies. (Hobsbawm, 1973 & 1974 & 1977) It is in the context of the prevalence of such an essentialist
analytical framework in Middle Eastern and Ottoman historiography that the specific problematic of this study was formulated. Let me elaborate.

This analytical framework derives from a paradigm that is employed in Middle East and Ottoman studies that combines the distinctive approach of Orientalism and the more general analytical framework of Social Anthropology. In this paradigm, it is Islam which constitutes a central explanatory category accounting for most aspects of socio-cultural reality and hence plays an important role in the interpretation of Middle Eastern and Ottoman society. As to the particular conceptualisation of Islam in this body of scholarship, it derives from a fusion of functionalist social anthropology and essentialist-oriented Orientalism. (Asad, 1973b: 113) Furthermore, it is the ideological nature of such interpretations which also add to the limitations of such an analytical framework. For it is possible to suggest that the underlying concern of this paradigm has been to contrast the a priori, essentialist, and a-historical Islamic characterisation of Middle Eastern and Ottoman society with Western - Judeo-Christian civilisation - progress and development. (Glavanis and Glavanis, 1983: 5-9) It is not surprising, therefore, that the non-Muslim communities - Christian and Jewish - are perceived as exemplifying all the characteristics of Western civilisation and are thus capable of acting as agents of modernisation.

Such an approach to the study of society, of course, precludes any consideration of the changing relations of power and the ability to exploit which have continuously transformed the socio-political and economic structures and systems of classes in the periphery. This is because it would necessitate the location of scholarly research within
an analytical framework which posits the uneven development of a global capitalist economy and the dialectical nature of centre-periphery relations as the two central problematics of the analysis. It should be noted, however, that the first problematic - the development of a global capitalist economy - has been adopted as the central concern of several recent interpretations of Middle Eastern and Ottoman socio-economic and political history which have attempted to challenge the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm and produce an alternative conceptualisation.

"Agenda for Ottoman History", published in 1977 by Huri İslamoğlu and Çağlar Keyder, was one of the first attempts to "...provide the conceptual framework in which new research problems may be defined." (İslamoğlu and Keyder, 1977: 31) Their work was inspired primarily by the methodology and concerns of the world-systems approach, which was briefly discussed above, and it attempted to construct an alternative approach to the study of Middle Eastern and Ottoman society. This, of course, permitted the evolutionary and global analytical framework that is inherent in the world-systems approach to be introduced into the scholarly research which focuses on this region of the periphery. Such an analytical framework, despite the limitations already discussed above, challenged the prevailing functionalist-Orientalist paradigm "...of society in 'stasis' and 'isolated' in its civilizational specificity." (İslamoğlu and Keyder, 1977: 35) Thus, it is possible to suggest that the introduction of the world-systems approach into the arena of Middle East and Ottoman historiography has constituted the first serious and systematic challenge to the prevalent functionalist-Orientalist paradigm. (Glavanis and Glavanis, 1983: 34-43)

The rapid development of the world-systems type of historical accounts has contributed to the emergence of a new school of scholarship within
Middle East and Ottoman studies. Two recent contributions from this alternative school by Faruk Tabak (1988) and Reşat Kasaba (1988) are particularly relevant to the primary concern of this study - the Greek community in Alexandria. Thus, in order both to evaluate this new style of historiography and to provide a substantive comparative framework for this study, it is worth presenting a brief exposition of their methodological approach and substantive conclusions.

Based on extensive historical research of nineteenth century developments in the Fertile Crescent region of the Ottoman Empire, Tabak argues that the

...emphasis placed upon the role played by the minorities provides only a partial explanation of the dynamics of social change in the Ottoman Levant. The overwhelming dominance of small-holding peasantry in imperial society meant that the mobilization of rural surplus required a wide-ranging mercantile network, the territorial compass of which extended from distant and humble villages to market towns and commercial metropolises...Within this vastly overstaffed mercantile community, regardless of the disproportionate representation of minority groups, the realm of commerce was commodious enough to accommodate Muslim traders. Yet within the realm of Ottoman studies we are confronted with a striking absence or invisibility of Muslim merchants. As such, the valorization of minorities at the expense of the Muslim trading community depends, tacitly or explicitly, on a set of assumptions governing the historical accounts of the process of incorporation, and it is these assumptions that need to be addressed and subjected to a critical scrutiny. (Tabak, 1988: 180)

Relying upon a plethora of historical documentation, Tabak is able to conclude his study by noting that although non-Muslim merchants did capture maritime export trade, the commercial activities of Muslim traders, especially of the inter-regional variety, continued to prosper. (Tabak, 1988: 207-9) As such, this study constitutes an important substantive departure from a body of scholarly literature which due to its methodological approach and assumptions has systematically ignored the historical role of Muslim-indigenous merchant capital in the
nineteenth century transformations experienced by this region of the periphery. Nevertheless, despite the stated intentions of the research project, the analysis presented by Tabak ultimately fails to dispose of the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm. This is due to the fact that Tabak, guided as he is by the world-systems approach, is primarily concerned to extend the parameters of the global capitalist economy. In doing so, of course, he presents extensive materials which emphasises the role of Muslim merchants. Tabak, however, neglects to question the assumptions which have attributed to the non-Muslim merchants a particular role in the process of Ottoman modernisation. This otherwise excellent economic history of the Fertile Crescent during the nineteenth century, therefore, exemplifies the elements of an empiricist response to the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm.

Tabak's study does not provide a conceptual and methodological framework within which commercial activities within the Ottoman Empire - whether carried out by Muslim or non-Muslim merchants - can be evaluated and characterised. In other words, his study fails to consider the often contradictory role of merchant and interest-bearing capital in the dialectical relations between the periphery and the development of the global capitalist economy. It is not possible, therefore, to determine the extent to which the commercial activities of the non-Muslim merchants, for example, may have reflected differential interests in the centre-periphery relations. This is because Tabak accepts the a priori methodological assumption that non-Muslim merchants automatically transmitted the interests and objectives of European merchant capital. Thus, instead of subjecting the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm to a critical scrutiny, Tabak's research effort is reduced to providing an
argument that locates the Muslim merchants on a par with the non-Muslims.

Such methodological limitations, of course, are derived from the adoption of the world-systems approach. This accounts, therefore, for Tabak's a priori methodological assumption that all forms of commerce contributed in a similar manner to the expansion of capitalism within the Ottoman Empire and that analytical differentiations are irrelevant. It is at this level of the analysis that the world-systems approach collapses into the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm where any attempt to valorise the activities of any one category of merchants invariably has to rely upon emiricist and essentialist arguments. As such, the conceptual and methodological assumptions of the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm remain intact.

Furthermore, the ideologically-defined categories themselves - Muslim and non-Muslim - are reproduced in an un-critical manner. Tabak's failure to problematise such categories, therefore, prevents the consideration of the manner in which ethnic and religious affiliation may have been constructed and re-constructed in relation to the on-going socio-economic and political transformations. Thus, it is possible to conclude that ideologically-defined categories continue to constitute the primary objectives of historical research and the analytical parameters within which substantive material is analysed. In this respect, therefore, Tabak's analysis is in fact quite similar to the work produced by the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm. Operating with ethnic, religious and other forms of primary solidarity as the sole analytical categories for identifying the different communities in the Ottoman Empire, Tabak's challenge to the predominant paradigm is reduced to a simple substitution of one ideologically-defined category by
another. This, of course, does not deny the importance of the substantive contribution made by Tabak, which at least suggests that different ethnic and religious groups were equally prominent in the process of socio-economic and political transformations during the nineteenth century.

The work of Reşat Kasaba (1988) represents another study from the world-systems school which also makes certain important substantive contributions, but fails to challenge the prevailing functionalist-Orientalism paradigm. Kasaba's primary concern is to question the assumption held by many scholars that focus their research on Middle Eastern and Ottoman society, that there existed "...a structural subservience of local non-Muslim intermediaries to the interests of foreign capital." (Kasaba, 1988: 216) Specifically, his study focuses on the role and activities of Greek and Armenian merchants in the Western Anatolia region of the Ottoman Empire during the early and middle decades of the nineteenth century. In distinct contrast to Tabak's work, however, Kasaba formulates direct socio-political and economic questions which are particularly pertinent to an account of the dialectics of centre-periphery relations. The central problematic of his study can be summarised as follows: Did the Greek merchants in Izmir, for example, act as compradors or did they attempt to develop as a new commercial bourgeoisie which would ultimately challenge the hegemony of the Ottoman bureaucracy?

Kasaba highlights the historical inaccuracy of the scholarly work which characterises Greek and Armenian merchants as compradors, and concludes that "in none of these periods, and definitely not in the mid-nineteenth century, did they serve as mere proxies for foreign capital." (Kasaba, 1988: 225) Furthermore, Kasaba goes on to conclude
...that western Anatolian intermediaries [Greeks and Armenians] can be credited more with preventing the implantation of foreign capital in western Anatolia than serving as a handmaiden for it...[In fact] the historical significance of non-Muslim intermediaries lies not in their chameleon-like relations with foreign capitalists but in the fact that they were the first, and probably the only group in the Ottoman-Turkish history to have acquired power from sources outside of the immediate sphere of control of the bureaucracy. As such their rise should be seen as an incipient development of a capitalist class in the Ottoman Empire. (Kasaba, 1988: 226)

In this respect, Kasaba's work exemplifies the evolutionary and non-dialectical logic inherent in the world-systems approach and the work of many Marxists who focus on a study of centre-periphery relations. This is due to the fact that he operates with a methodological assumption that all mercantile activity invariably facilitated the extension of capitalism. Thus, the primary concern of Kasaba's substantive research is limited to a search for the historical material which can establish the commercial links between the Ottoman Empire and the development of the global capitalist economy. Having, of course, established the commercial links between the Ottoman Empire and the global capitalist economy, the existence of a capitalist class - comprador or indigenous - is taken for granted. Thus, Kasaba's project is reduced to a concern with the characterisation of this capitalist class. Given, however, that the substantive material highlighted the differential interests that characterised centre-periphery commercial relations, Kasaba's analysis concludes that the non-Muslim merchants should be characterised as an indigenous capitalist class. This is because Kasaba's approach negates at a conceptual level the possibility that such a juxtaposition - between compradors and indigenous capitalist - may in fact mystify the dynamics of transformation in the Ottoman Empire.
Furthermore, albeit inadvertently, Kasaba provides indirectly a Marxist legitimation for the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm which conceptualises non-Muslim minorities as the sole European agents of modernisation during the transformations experienced by this region of the periphery during the nineteenth century. This is due to the fact that for Kasaba, the non-Muslim merchants were "the only group in the Ottoman-Turkish history to have acquired power from sources outside of the immediate sphere of control of the bureaucracy." (Kasaba, 1988: 226) In other words, the non-Muslim communities derived their power as a direct result of their contacts with European merchant capital.

Ultimately, therefore, it is possible to suggest that once again it is the conceptual and methodological limitations of the world-system analysis which are responsible for Kasaba's failure to challenge the prevalent paradigm. This, of course, is due to the fact that the world-systems approach ignores the dialectical and contradictory developments of centre-periphery relations. Instead, it proposes an evolutionary account of these relations which in fact also emphasises the universally progressive nature of capitalism and the generalised development of capitalist relations. Nevertheless, such conceptual and methodological limitations should not detract from the fact that Kasaba's work is an important substantive contribution. This is due to the fact that at least it highlights the active indigenous, albeit non-Muslim, role in the centre-periphery relations during the nineteenth century.

This brief discussion of two examples that belong to the world systems approach exemplifies one of the alternative interpretations emerging in Middle East and Ottoman historiography. Furthermore, the discussion has served a dual purpose. On the one hand, at a conceptual and methodological level, it has emphasised the necessity of adopting a
methodological framework which derives from a dialectic conceptualisation of centre-periphery relations. This is in order to permit a critical consideration of the different ideologically-defined categories of merchants and the differential valorisation of their respective roles in the process of the Ottoman Empire's integration into the global capitalist economy. This is particularly important if an attempt will be made to avoid replacing the inadequacies of the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm with those of the world system approach.

On the other hand, the conclusions of Tabak and Kasaba constitute the general framework within which the specificity of this study can be elaborated. The two studies discussed above characterise non-Muslim merchants in terms of an analytical juxtaposition of two categories - compradors or indigenous capitalists - both of which are seen to derive their power from direct links with European merchant capital. Subsequent chapters of this study, however, will suggest that such an a priori analytical assumption and dichotomy fails when applied to the contradictory nature and role played by one particular non-Muslim group of merchants, namely the Greeks in Alexandria. In particular this study will argue that it is the contradictory and constantly changing role of commercial and interest-bearing capital which determined both the primary and secondary affiliations of this group of merchants.

Furthermore, and in distinct contrast to the two studies discussed above, this study will argue that such ideologically-defined categories as the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria achieve analytical significance only in relation to the on-going transformations being experienced by the peripheral society during its incorporation into the global capitalist economy. In other words, such categories are constructed and
re-constructed according to the requirements of the dialectic of centre-periphery relations. Thus, in concluding this section of the introduction, it is possible to suggest that this study attempts to contribute to the formulation of a conceptual framework which constitutes a challenge to the functionalist-Orientalist paradigm as well as avoiding the limitations of the world systems analysis.
IV. Nineteenth Century Egyptian History: Some Critical Remarks

The continuing failure of capitalist relations of production to become generalised within Third World countries as well as within the centres of industrial capitalism has in recent years instigated a re-examination of the nature of capitalism and its ability to dissolve and supplant non-capitalist forms of production. This theoretical issue has constituted one of the concerns of some scholars who focus on the study of underdeveloped societies. In some aspects already mentioned in the Preface, this present study reflects the recent introduction of such debates in the field of Middle East scholarship and as such it is hoped that it will encourage the generalisation of their discussion. This is due to the fact that Middle East studies, and in particular the study of modern history, is characterised by a paucity of any serious theoretical and conceptual debate and analysis. The predominant functionalist-orientalist paradigm with its modernisation variant and a small, but influential, number of evolutionary-oriented interpretations that rely upon Lenin's work, The Development of Capitalism in Russia (1967), constitute virtually the only alternative approaches to the study of Middle Eastern society.

The introduction of these new debates in the field of Middle East studies, therefore, constitutes a theoretical contribution in so far as it includes a re-formulation of conventional Marxism and an application to contemporary Middle Eastern social reality. The significance of these contributions derives from the fact that they employ categories originating from within the discourse of historical materialism in order to re-examine and analyse phenomena that have been taken for granted by other scholars. This is particularly so with regard to conventional historical materialism which tends to generalise about the effects of
the development of the global capitalist economy and the dialectic of centre-periphery relations. Instead, these new debates situate the dialectical and contradictory nature of centre-periphery relations at the centre of their analysis of capitalist expansion. In fact, it is this problematic which also constitutes the primary theoretical concern of this study of the Greek community in Alexandria in the context of an analytical discussion of Egypt's integration into the global capitalist economy during the nineteenth century.

This is in distinct contrast to the functionalist-orientalist paradigm which sees the historical process of Egypt's integration into the global capitalist economy in terms of essentialist characterisations of Arab and Islamic society. Similarly, this study differs from the evolutionist and Lenin-inspired scholarship which ignores the dialectic of centre-periphery relations in favour of a vacuous concept of generalised capitalist expansion. Nevertheless, in order to highlight the manner in which this particular study of nineteenth century Egypt differs from either of the two prevalent paradigms, each will be discussed briefly below.

1. The functionalist-orientalist paradigm

In order to evaluate this influential body of literature, the classic historical study, *The Modern History of Egypt* by P. J. Vatikiotis (1969), has been selected for a brief discussion. The choice, it might be added, is particularly appropriate as P. J. Vatikiotis with his prolific scholarly output is considered by many as the father of modern Egyptian historiography. This position of prominence is derived primarily from two factors: first, from the fact that his interpretations reflect perfectly the functionalist-orientalist paradigm; and second, from the
fact that as a Greek who was born in Palestine and grew up in Egypt he is considered to combine the insights of a Middle Easterner, albeit from the Greek community, with the objective scholarly ability of a Western-trained academic.

*The Modern History of Egypt* is Vatikiotis' most extensive and scholarly study which has been accepted as the basic text for the interpretation of modern Egyptian history. It is worth noting at this point that although the book first appeared in 1969 - the year in which Nasir died - its structure and analysis were planned out in the United States during the academic year 1961-62. Those familiar with Egyptian history will know that this year marks one of the lowest points in Egyptian-Western relations since the 1952 Revolution. This should be related to the stated objective of the study which is concerned to examine the forces that led to a situation in which

*The revolutionary leadership of the Egyptian Free Officers in the 1950s sought in the name of Arab Nationalism and Arab Socialism to lead at least the Arab Islamic world to development and power and, in doing so, to exclude West Europeans and Americans - some would argue outsiders in general - from exerting influence or control in the Middle East. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 12)*

Given the objective of the study, Vatikiotis notes that in order "...to understand these peculiarities [anti-Western] of the Egyptian in the modern world it is helpful to trace the development of Egypt over the 1st hundred and fifty years." (Vatikiotis, 1969: 12) Thus, Vatikiotis attempts to present a substantive account of transformations experienced by Egyptian society during the period 1800 to 1962. His conceptualisation of change, however, leads him to focus his substantive analysis on the "problem" of the apparent failure of modern, western, liberal ideology to take hold in Egyptian society as exemplified in the crucial decade of the 1930s - which is usually referred to as the period
of "the crisis of orientation of Egyptian intellectuals". Vatikiotis' substantive account brings out first the early positive response of Egyptians to Western, secular liberalism and constitutional government, and then the later revulsion of Egyptians from the earlier kind of response which favoured processes of Europeanisation and their retreat first, to conservative religious and fascist paths, and soon thereafter their recourse to military revolution...[and] the abandonment of an adopted European model and the rejection of its inherent liberalism in favour of a militant and authoritarian revival. (Vatikiotis, 1969: xv)

In addressing himself to this apparent paradox in Egyptian history, Vatikiotis produces the following periodisation for his substantive account: 1805-1882, during which was laid the social and political foundations of modern Egypt; 1882-1930, during which the positive response toward Europe dominated Egyptian society; and 1930-1962, during which there occurred the failure of liberalism and the reaction against Europe. This particular periodisation achieves its analytical significance when it is noted that in contrast to the stated objective to present a historical account of changes, Vatikiotis is primarily concerned to emphasise the fact that

despite the revolution of July 1952, and on the basis of this survey at least which covers a hundred and fifty years of modern Egyptian history, the nature of rule and patterns of social and political behaviour continue to be influenced more by what Egyptians inherited from their past than by radical ideological changes...[Thus] more technical considerations of economic and fiscal matters have not been highlighted. The importance of these matters cannot of course be minimized, yet their inclusion in a volume such as this was deemed distracting. [my emphasis] (Vatikiotis, 1969: xiv)

Vatikiotis' substantive account proceeds to define the essential character of Egyptian society. This is accomplished by continually stressing "...the continuity in Egyptian society from ancient times to this day" (Vatikiotis, 1969: xiv) in which "conservatism, isolation, and
a long-established traditional social structure comprise what one might call Egypt's permanent 'Egyptianity'...[whose essential feature] has been that of a rural nation, whose existence was regulated by the flow of the Nile." (Vatikiotis, 1969: 10) Furthermore, Vatikiotis points out that the isolation and continuity "...bred a docile people content with their attitude of surrender to both physical environment and social and political authority...and with a blind faith in a tradition which cherished the past." (Vatikiotis, 1969: 447) Thus, it is possible to suggest that the main theme of the study is the process "...by which this continuity, influenced and modified by Islam and the Arabic language, has shaped the collective and individual beliefs of the Egyptian people, their view of the world, their relations with one another and with their rulers." (Vatikiotis, 1969: xiv)

It is within such an analytical framework that Vatikiotis presents his substantive account of the different historical periods. He first examines in some detail the reign of Muhammad 'Ali, "the modernising autocrat", and that of Isma'il, "the impatient Europeaniser". His interpretation of both periods, however, is in terms of assessing the success of Western institutions of parliamentary democracy and notions of secular liberalism in being able to establish themselves firmly in Egyptian society. In such a context, Vatikiotis concludes that the results of the policies adopted by both rulers were largely in the form of material changes whose effects on the "...social and intellectual conditions in Egypt...were not so profound as to drastically change the nature of political power, authority, or the political community in the country." (Vatikiotis, 1969: 88-9) This was due to the fact that "while the influx of ideas in this period [1805-1882] was great, the
institutional direction of socio-economic change did not really begin until foreign tutelage was direct and complete." (Vatikiotis, 1969: 161)

It is the analysis of the second period that highlights the characteristics of foreign tutelage. In this section, Vatikiotis emphasises that in addition to its civilising impact, the British occupation also carried out an extensive policy of reforms. Such a policy, Vatikiotis noted, was the means through "...which by the turn of the century had [been] produced new and different political conditions." (Vatikiotis, 1969: 178) This he explained was despite "the essentially Islamic and conservative response of Egyptians during the first twenty-five years of the British occupation...(which was due to)...their traditional-sentimental inclination as Muslim men." (Vatikiotis, 1969: 203) Nevertheless, "when after 1904-6, Britain had succeeded in helping Egypt to attain some measure of material development in the teeth of other European opposition...(the) Egyptian response to Europe and particularly Britain changed too: from a conservative Islamic one to a secular liberal orientation towards political action against the occupying power." (Vatikiotis, 1969: 203)

It should be clear from the above that Vatikiotis' account of Egyptian history during the nineteenth century is highly problematic. In effect, his account is characterised by the absence of any analysis of the profound structural transformations that took place in Egyptian society during the nineteenth century. For though it is possible to agree with Vatikiotis that Western, secular liberalism - as defined by Vatikiotis - did not prevail in Egyptian socio-political and cultural structures, it cannot be concluded that no basic transformation occurred, and that in essence Egyptian society remained unchanged. Vatikiotis, however, is almost exclusively concerned to affirm and re-affirm the essential
character of the Egyptian political structures. As such he neglects the drastic structural transformations that did occur and instead presents a somewhat simplistic and ideological interpretation in which only a few economic changes are recorded arbitrarily. Ignoring such "distractions", of course, has serious political and ideological ramifications.

In concluding this partial, but critical evaluation of The Modern History of Egypt, it is possible to suggest that in order to attempt a viable interpretation of nineteenth century Egyptian socio-economic and political history, the fundamental basis of the analysis has to be transformed. Rather than focusing exclusively on a priori defined primary forms of social solidarity - such as Egyptianity, Islam, and the Arabic language - as aspects of an unchanging tradition, the analysis needs to consider the dialectic of centre-periphery relations in the wider context of Egypt's integration into the global capitalist economy. It is only then that it is possible to interpret the dynamics of nineteenth century Egyptian history, including the developing consciousness of its people.

Prior to concluding the discussion of the functionalist-orientalist paradigm, it is important to note that not all such contributions neglect economic transformations to the same extent as Vatikiotis. On the contrary, it is possible to suggest that there is a set of contributions which may be characterised as the economic variant of this paradigm. Studies of modern Egypt by such scholars as A E Crouchley (1936 & 1938), Charles Issawi (1947, 1954, 1961, and 1963) and Roger Owen (1969), to mention only those whose work has been most influential, have devoted almost exclusive attention to economic transformations. However, the analytical framework within which they interpret these
economic transformations is essentially derived from a neo-classical economic paradigm whose basic theoretical assumptions are quite similar to those underlying the functionalist-orientalist paradigm. The argument must be elaborated.

Most of the scholarship that focuses on the economic transformations experienced by Egyptian society during the nineteenth century derives from the branch of neo-classical economic theory which is concerned with the underdeveloped economies of the periphery. It is, of course, beyond the scope of this section of the introduction to present a critique of its major assumptions or substantive scholarly production. This is particularly so since the range of literature which attempts such a critique is probably the most extensive within the field of development studies. Nevertheless, it is important to outline some of the basic assumptions which are employed by those scholars who focus their research on Egypt.

In general, this literature relies heavily on a Rostow-derived concept of historical change and sees economic development as a unilinear transition from one type of society to another. With regard to the societies in the periphery, this argument assumes that they will pass through the same idealised path of historical development as that supposedly experienced by the advanced industrial nations. In this respect, therefore, their approach is as Eurocentric as that of the functionalist-orientalist paradigm. Furthermore, given that their ideal of a developed society is derived from a particular conceptualisation of what Western societies are supposed to be like, this economic approach also shares the essentialist characterisation of the functionalist-orientalist paradigm.

*Underlying this conception is the erroneous assumption that underdevelopment was synonymous to poverty... Underdeveloped*
countries were seen as being like the developed ones at an earlier stage of the development, so that they would have to pass through Rostow's 'stages' if they were to 'take off' from the stage of 'traditional society' to that of 'mass consumption'. (Radwan, 1975: 94)

When examining the Egyptian economy from the 1950s to the present day, all these scholars are in agreement that Egyptian society is still underdeveloped and in some respects has failed to 'take off'. This observation is not dissimilar to Vatikiotis' conceptualisation of modern Egypt, and it has led these economists to seek the reasons for this underdevelopment in Egypt's economic history during the nineteenth century. In an attempt to account for this supposed persistent underdevelopment, Charles Issawi (1961)

ascribed the country's 'lop-sided development' since 1800 to the fact that expansion in the export sector (cotton) failed to be transmitted to the rest of the economy. In Issawi's view, in the course of development a country passes through three stages: from a subsistence economy to an export oriented economy and then to a complex economy. The collapse of Muhammad Ali's industrial plans for Egypt meant the end of the first phase of Egypt's modern economic growth. (Radwan, 1975: 95)

Thus, Issawi accounts for Egypt's contemporary underdevelopment in terms of the fact that during the nineteenth century "the attempted leap from a subsistence to a complex economy had failed, and instead the country had landed on the road leading to an export-oriented economy. Egypt would now be integrated as an agricultural unit in the world-wide economic system." (Issawi, 1961: 2) No reference was made to the role of centre-periphery relations or for that matter to the possible effects of Egypt's integration into a global capitalist economy. Instead, Issawi points out that it was not until the 1930s when "men's minds began to turn to industrialisation" (Issawi, 1961: 17) that a new stage of economic development was initiated. Here again, no mention is made of the fact that the British rulers of Egypt prohibited any form of
industrialisation which might compete with Lancashire production. The
work of Crouchley, Owen and other such economists reproduces almost
intact the assumptions and analysis presented by Issawi. Owen, for
example, devotes twenty-three pages at the end of his study on cotton to
"looking at the performance of the Egyptian economy during the
nineteenth century in wider perspective, and in particular to ask why it
was that growth should not have been accompanied by development." (Owen,
1969: 356) Throughout this discussion, however, no mention is made of
the centre-periphery relations or for that matter of the effects of
British colonial economic policies after Egypt was occupied in 1882.
Instead, Owen concentrates on three topics: first, a comparison between
the experiences of Egypt and Japan; second, a discussion of Egypt's
experience in the context of economic theories of trade and development;
and third, an examination of "...the special nature of Egypt's own
particular history." (Owen, 1969: 357) Owen concludes this analytical
discussion by pointing out that development was inhibited "...in part by
the un-responsive nature of the traditional sector, in part by certain
physical and political obstacles. It was also inhibited, to some small
extent, by the presence of a prosperous export sector itself." Once
more, no mention is made of the centre-periphery relations or the
effects of British rule on Egyptian economic development. (Owen, 1969:
375)

Prior to concluding this brief and somewhat schematic account of the
economic variant of the functionalist-orientalist paradigm, it is
important to emphasise that despite the conceptual and methodological
limitations of these studies, their substantive contributions are
important. Crouchley's work (1936), for example, is still the most
comprehensive account of banking and finance during the second half of
the nineteenth century. Furthermore, Owen's classic study, *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy, 1820-1914. A Study in Trade and Development* (1969), is the most comprehensive study to date of matters relating to the cultivation and marketing of cotton. It is for this reason that the substantive chapters that follow rely extensively on the data presented by these scholars, while their assumptions and analytical orientation are at various points subject to a critical appraisal. Furthermore, it should also be pointed out that it is the inadequacies in their substantive contributions which constitutes one of the reasons for the particular focus of this study on the economic role and activities of the Greeks in Alexandria. This is particularly so with regard to the work of Roger Owen (1969), given that the Greeks played a predominant role in the cultivation and marketing of cotton, but are, with the exception of a few minor references, noticeably absent from his discussion.

2. The Evolutionary and Lenin-inspired Interpretations

The colonial context within which the predominant functionalist-orientalist paradigm of modern Egyptian history was first nurtured structured its perspective and characterisation of the dynamics of socio-economic and political transformations. The conventional and essentialist paradigm was elaborated during the era of Imperialism in the Middle East, namely from the turn of this century to the 1950s. During this period "the whole Arab world was definitely brought into the capitalist system as a dominated periphery." (Amin. 1978: 24) It is with the rise of radical nationalism (Nasirism) in the 1950s and the ensuing struggles for independence that there emerged an indigenous scholarship which made the first attempt to challenge the predominant conceptualisation of modern Egyptian history. In general it is this
scholarship which constitutes the evolutionist and Lenin-inspired interpretations of nineteenth century socio-economic and political transformations.

The two decades of the 1950s and 1960s in the Middle East were characterised by a rapid movement towards independence in all the Arab states, except for Palestine, and by three fundamental features which structured social, political, and economic realities in the region:

Firstly, the bankruptcy of the Arab bourgeoisie and...the rise of the nationalist petit-bourgeoisie; secondly, the end of Britain's influence in the area, the growing role of the two superpowers, the U.S. and U.S.S.R...; thirdly, the affirmation of Zionist colonialism's expansionist character. The interaction between these three features was to determine the history of the period. (Amin, 1978: 50)

The most significant event during these two decades was the emergence of Nasirism as a major socio-political force in the region. Nasirism was not only a form of radical Arab nationalism, but much more so since it helped bring about a major restructuring of the socio-political and economic forces within Egypt and the region as a whole. It accomplished this by challenging both Western capitalist hegemony in the region and its indigenous allies. New social classes entered the political arena, and within a decade of Nasir coming to power, various forms of state capitalism emerged in several Arab countries reflecting the emergence of the petit-bourgeoisie as the new major political force. An essential aspect of these transformations was the centrality of agrarian policies which consisted primarily of a series of agrarian reform measures. In Egypt the first agrarian reform law was promulgated only six weeks after the July 1952 revolution and within the next two decades most Middle Eastern countries had followed along the same path.
The series of agrarian reforms, despite their inherent limitations, seriously challenged the socio-economic and political power of the landed aristocracies that had dominated most of the Middle East since their emergence in the latter half of the nineteenth century, albeit under the hegemony of Europeans. (Abdel-Fadil, 1975: 103) This significant dislocation of the agrarian structures in predominantly rural societies was the impetus for the emergence of new interpretations of the totality of socio-economic and political relations. These new interpretations were politically influenced by radical nationalism and theoretically inspired by a particular reading of Lenin's (1967) seminal work, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. (Glavanis and Glavanis, 1983: 22-3)

Lenin's classic analysis of the development of capitalism in Russia has been accepted uncritically by many social scientists as a model for the process of transformation in peripheral societies. Many writers seem to intent, regardless of their data, to argue that the days of non-capitalist relations are limited or that peasant household producers have the appearance of being peasants but are really not, thereby creating new analytical categories such as the 'disguised proletariat'. As will be shown below, Lenin's thesis and methodology have been reproduced by a significant number of Egyptian scholars.

Ibrahim 'Amir's *al-Ard wa'l-Fallah. al-Mas'ala al-Zira'iyya fi Misr* (Land and the Peasant. The Agrarian Question in Egypt) (1958), was by far one of the most influential studies to emerge during this period. 'Amir examines the transformation experienced by Egyptian agriculture from the nineteenth to the middle of the twentieth century, which he characterizes as a transition from feudalism to capitalism. Within this general schema, 'Amir discusses, on the one hand, the development of
private property, landlordism, and the intensification of commercial agriculture, and on the other, the concomitant increasing exploitation, marginalization, and proletarianization of the Egyptian peasantry. His portrayal of the developments in agrarian relations is primarily based upon an examination of changes in the pattern and differentiation of landownership by reference to aggregate statistics. Furthermore, he also emphasizes the centrality of increasing influence of land and credit banks and the production of cotton as a major commercial crop. Amir derives this framework from his own reading of Lenin and he applies the Leninist categories in a static manner. For example, by concentrating on landownership he neglects to consider the variety of forms of access to land available to the peasants which do not derive from direct ownership, such as sharecropping, labour-rent agreements, and other forms of tenancy, all of which are used by Lenin in his analysis.

'Amir's study of the transformation of agrarian relations in Egypt, published during the height of radical nationalism in the Arab world, provided the major impetus for an extensive use of the Leninist model by many other Egyptian scholars. Given the significance of Egypt in the region, both as an agrarian society and a socio-political and cultural leader, this body of scholarship also had a profound influence on scholars in most other Arab countries. (Glavanis & Glavanis, 1983: 17-8) Furthermore, it is important to note that it was Egyptian scholars who were the first to use this interpretation in order to challenge the predominant functionalist-orientalist paradigm.

In the study by another Egyptian scholar, Ra'uf 'Abbas Hamid, al-Nizam al-Ijtim'ai fi Misr fi Zil al-Milkiyyat al-Zira'iyya al-Kabira, 1837-
1914 (The Social System in Egypt under the Influence of the Large Landowners, 1837-1914) (1973)

[he] sets out to impress in the reader the importance of a relational concept of class. But, as he writes, because of the complexity of the land system and the different values of different types of land, this concept became very hard to employ. With reluctance, therefore, he accepted Cromer's definition (formulated in 1894) of a large landowner as someone who owned more than fifty feddans. (Gran, 1978: 370)

Cromer, of course, was the British Consul-General who effectively ruled Egypt from 1883 to 1908 and had formulated such definitions for the purposes of tax collection and control. Hamid's acceptance of such a definition of class structure highlights the problematic application of the Leninist methodology. In other words, his concern to follow Lenin in the use of aggregate quantitative data relating to landholdings, in a situation where the historical archives do not provide the necessary material, forced Hamid to adopt categories and data generated by the British Consul-General. Such categories and data, of course, are incapable of permitting a discussion of the social relations of production which is fundamental to a class analysis. Thus, Hamid, although claiming to rely upon the Leninist approach, in fact provides a descriptive account of the stratification of landownership rather than a class analysis of agrarian relations.

It should be acknowledged, of course, that the Egyptian archives for the nineteenth century do not contain the richness of data that was available to Lenin. Nevertheless, adopting a methodology which requires the reliance upon aggregate statistical data is necessarily going to generate major problems in any attempt to provide a class analysis of agrarian relations. In Egypt during this period, a class analysis should be located in relation to her dependent position in an international division of labour and the presence of powerful British
interests in her economic and political affairs. Agrarian relations should be examined in the context of the preponderant cultivation of cotton as a commercial export crop and the domination by non-Egyptian capital by virtue of an almost exclusive control over the marketing and pricing of the commodity. Sole reference to aggregate statistical data on landownership, therefore, is an inadequate indicator of the changing nature of class relations which obtained in Egypt during this period. For the power which conditioned Egyptian agrarian class relations lay beyond her political borders. Hamid does discuss Egypt's dependent status and the significance of cotton, but fails to use such factors in his 'class' analysis because of his rigid application of the Leninist methodology. The Russia that Lenin studied, however, differed significantly from Egypt in that colonialism and monoculture were absent.

The Arab-Israeli war of 1967, and especially the Zionist occupation of the rest of Palestine, sent massive shock waves throughout the Middle East that posed a serious challenge to the hegemony of Nasirism in the region. Simultaneously, Western powers seized the opportunity to re-establish their hegemony in the region and within a short period of time the Middle East witnessed the rapid dissolution of the radical socio-economic, political and intellectual trends that had dominated the region since 1952. This clearly highlighted the limitations of this form of radical nationalism when used as a basis to bring about a radical transformation of dependent societies.

The limitations of radical nationalism, in its Nasirist form, and the implications of reliance upon state capitalism were also reflected in the writings of Egyptian intellectuals. Many of those intellectuals who had espoused Nasirism sought new analytical frameworks which would allow
them to account for the demise of radical nationalism and the failure of
state capitalism to bring about social transformation. It is among
those intellectuals that there emerged another attempt to re-examine
socio-economic and political relations which, it was argued, had been
inadequately interpreted during the height of Nasirism. This new
attempt to re-interpret modern Egyptian history still relied heavily on
the Leninist model, but sought to incorporate the effects of integration
into the world economy in their attempts to account for the continuing
underdevelopment of Egyptian society.

In fact, Egyptian society continued to be integrated as a dependent
region in the capitalist international division of labour. Such a
process of integration posed a challenge to the survival capabilities of
non-capitalist forms of production, but did not in effect result in the
emergence of homogeneous capitalist forms of production and social
organization. Instead earlier social structures mediated this increased
integration of Egyptian society into the world-economy in such a manner,
so that paths of integration exhibited a variety of outcomes ranging
from full proletarianization to partial proletarianization and to
independent commodity production.

The impact of these new socio-political and economic realities is most
evident in the work of Salih Muhammad Salih, *al-Iqta' wa'l-Ra'smaliyya
al-Zira'iyya fi Misr min 'Abd Muhammad 'Ali ila 'Abd al-Nasir* (Feudalism and Agricultural Capitalism in Egypt from the Era of
Muhammad Ali to the Era of 'Abd al-Nasir) (1979). In fact, the book was
written as a specific critique of Ibrahim 'Amir's influential work.
Salih emphasises the need for and importance of a critique of the mode
of analysis employed by 'Amir, particularly in light of the political
implications which followed from it. For 'Amir assumed that Egypt had
undergone its transition to capitalism within the agrarian sector during Muhammad Ali's reign at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Salih argues that 'Amir utilised incorrect indicators in evaluating the extent of capitalist development in rural Egypt, for instance landownership statistics, land and credit bank activities, and the unification of the taxation system. All of these are criticised and dismissed as being inadequate. Essentially, Salih argues that none of these reveal the transformation of the relations of production to capitalism, and thus 'Amir underestimates the extent of feudal relations existing in Egyptian society. Likewise, Salih emphasises the international dimension, something absent in 'Amir's work, stressing the forced integration of Egypt into the world market and the consequent disarticulation of the Egyptian social formation.

Nevertheless, Salih's alternative remains within the Leninist thesis of the inevitability of generalised capitalist relations, which is made clear to the reader by the myriad of quotations from Lenin's work. Salih argues that the extent of the development of the capitalist mode of production must be measured by reference to three indicators: 1) the extent of the use of large-scale machinery; 2) the extent of commodity production; and 3) the extent of wage labour. However, in his discussion, he places emphasis on the first two factors, in other words the development of the productive forces and the market economy, as does Lenin. The third factor, which in some respects is the most crucial, receives limited attention. Hence, he fails to focus on relations of production, of which wage labour represents a part of the central duality - capital and labour. Likewise, he does not examine the phenomenon of wage labour within the peasant household unit of production, where wage labour may in fact play the role of reinforcing
rather than dissolving non-capitalist forms of production. Thus, Salih concludes that the essential parameters of transformation in Egyptian society are capitalist.

Samir Radwan in his study, *Capital Formation in Egyptian Agriculture and Industry, 1882-1967* (1974), argues that "Egypt's dependence resulted from an essentially agricultural economy, geared almost unilaterally to the cultivation and export of cotton, and from the direct grip of foreign banks and corporations on the country's main centres of economic activity." (Radwan, 1974: 233) Clearly the incorporation of Egypt's integration into the international division of labour as a dependent society as part of the analytical framework is an important contribution to the earlier Leninist interpretations that followed 'Amir's approach. Nevertheless, Radwan, who also relies upon Andre Gunder Frank and the Dependency school, accounts for the changing class structure and the role of the state solely by reference to three phases of development:

- the export economy phase extending from the 1850s to the 1920s;
- the phase of import substitution industrialization which began in the 1920s and 1930s, gathered momentum during World War II and reached its peak in the 1950s; and finally the phase of 'planned development' covering the 1950s and the 1960s.

(Radwan, 1974: 233)

Radwan's pioneering study, therefore, is still unable to account for or interpret changes in the forces and relations of production which dominated Egyptian society during the period under consideration. For his conceptualisation of class relations is still moulded to 'Amir's particular use of the Leninist methodology, namely a reliance upon aggregate statistics for the presentation of a stratification of landownership, albeit in the context of a descriptive account of Egypt's location in the international division of labour.
The attempt to re-examine socio-economic and political agrarian relations initiated by Egyptian scholars also served as an impetus for similar re-examinations to take place amongst some western scholars who were concerned with Egyptian society. Alan Richards, for example, in his study *Egypt's Agricultural Development, 1800-1980: Technical and Social Change* (1982), assumes the extension of capitalism and thereby implies the polarization of agrarian relations along capitalist lines. His central argument for the extension of capitalist relations in the rural sector derives from his suggestion that

> the phenomenon of primitive accumulation in Egypt was inseparable from that country's integration into the capitalist world system. Capitalism came to Egypt with cotton; resulted in large numbers of peasants losing all decision-making power over their land. In short, they were dispossessed. (Richards, 1982: 39)

At this point it might be necessary to note that Lenin's thesis was far more sophisticated and complex than the manner in which he has been used by Egyptian scholars. (Tribe, 1979: 1-8) Furthermore, Lenin's approach represents a particular tendency within the Marxist tradition and in fact follows one of the two alternative interpretations found in Marx's own writings that were discussed in a previous section of this introduction - the interpretation that is characterised by the necessary development of generalised capitalist production.

Thus, it is possible to suggest that the bulk of contemporary Marxist-oriented Egyptian historiography is characterised both by its inadequate 'translation' of Lenin's classic study and an evolutionary approach to the study of socio-economic and political transformations. In this latter respect, this Egyptian scholarship shares many a priori assumptions and substantive conclusions with the world-systems approach that characterises some of the recent contributions to Ottoman
It is not surprising, therefore, that this body of scholarship neglects the dialectic of centre-periphery relations, even when its analysis focuses on Egypt's integration into the global capitalist economy. This, of course, may be one of the factors which has encouraged this scholarly orientation to ignore the economic role and activities of the Greek community. Greek entrepreneurs have been characterised a priori as compradors and thus dissolved into the general category of European capital. They do not, therefore, merit specific consideration in the research agenda of these recent contributions to Egyptian historiography. As this study will attempt to argue, however, Greek entrepreneurs exemplified a contradictory role during the nineteenth century incorporation of Egyptian society into the global capitalist economy. Thus, a focus on their economic activities might suggest a more complex reading of nineteenth century Egyptian history than that which has been presented by either the functionalist-orientalist paradigm or the evolutionary Lenin-inspired interpretations.

Such a focus, however, is almost universally absent from Egyptian historiography. The only serious consideration of the role and activities of the Greek and other non-Muslim communities during the nineteenth century appears in a short article - ten pages - that was published in 1978 by the historian, Marius Deeb, who could be said to

...that these local foreign minorities can be regarded as a major agent of change affecting the internal development of Egypt's social and economic history. We are not asserting the platitudinous fact that they were agents of modernization but rather that they, collectively and unwittingly, transformed the socioeconomic structure of Egyptian society. This was particularly true of the period of their rise and unchallenged economic dominance, that is up to World War I...the period from 1919 onwards was a period of gradual decline which culminated in the socialist measures of the early 1960s, which almost completely destroyed the basis of their power, and which consequently led to their ultimate disintegration as a group. (Deeb, 1978: 11-2)

Relying primarily upon the accounts produced by European travellers to Egypt during the nineteenth century and Bowring's Report on Egypt and Candia (1840), Deeb presents a general account of some of the activities of the non-Muslim entrepreneurs - Greeks, Jews and Levantine Christians. On the basis of such limited data, Deeb concludes that "the local foreign minorities acting as 'agents' of European capitalist expansion introduced market relations into the countryside." (Deeb, 1978: 16)

Such a conceptualisation of the role of the non-Muslim communities converges perfectly with the underlying problematic of this short article. This emerges in the second half of the article and focuses on the manner in which the activities of the non-Muslim entrepreneurs prepared the groundwork for the emergence of an Egyptian national bourgeoisie in the post-1919 period. In particular, Deeb is concerned to show that the emergence of the Egyptian nationalist bourgeoisie - exemplified by him in the activities of Muhammad Tal'at Harb and the Bank Misr group of entrepreneurs - was "...obviously a reaction to the economic domination of local foreigners, which had reached its
culmination during the period of the British occupation." (Deeb, 1978: 18)

Thus, it is possible to suggest that it is Deeb's evolutionary conceptualisation of the development of "generalised capitalist production" relations in Egypt that led him to examine, albeit in a superficial manner, the role and activities of non-Muslim communities. This, of course, was deemed necessary in order to provide the historical background and *raison d'être* for the emergence of the national bourgeoisie in the post-1919 period. Deeb fails, therefore, to consider the possible contradictory historical role of these non-Muslim communities and in many respects his substantive account confirms the a priori assumptions that exemplify both the functionalist-orientalist paradigm and the evolutionary Lenin-oriented interpretations. In other words that the non-Muslim communities constituted the primary agents for the extension of modernisation or capitalist relations and thus inadvertently led to the emergence of anti-European attitudes or the development of indigenous capitalism. The alternative perceptions, of course, depend on which of the two prevalent interpretations is being stressed.

Despite the brevity and conceptual limitations, Deeb's contribution constitutes an important landmark in modern Egyptian historiography. At least, it was a contribution which devoted a certain degree of attention to the role and activities of the non-Muslim communities. Nevertheless, his pioneering contribution has yet to be followed or elaborated. It is for this reason, therefore, that the only available histories of the various non-Muslim communities are those written by the communities themselves. With regard to the Greek community, for example, there is a plethora of studies written by Greek scholars in Egypt which are located
in various community archives and libraries in the various cities and towns where the Greeks lived.\textsuperscript{22} The only exceptions are two Ph.D. theses and a few studies which examined the history of the Greek community in Alexandria as a result of a primary concern with the life and work of the Greek Alexandrine poet Cavafy.

Of the two doctoral research projects, it is the work of Christos Hadziiossif, \textit{La Colonie Grecque en Egypte, 1833-1856} (1980) which is of primary concern to this study. The second doctoral project is by Alexander Kitroeff and focuses on the activities of the Greek community in Egypt during the inter-war period. It is Hadziiossif's work, therefore, which constitutes practically the only systematic scholarly study which concerns itself with the role and activities of the Greek community in Egypt during the nineteenth century. Thus, the substantive chapters of this present study concerning the Greeks in Alexandria have relied extensively on Hadziiossif's work - with regard to the first half of the nineteenth century - where the two projects overlap for a period of two decades.

Hadziiossif, however, is primarily concerned to situate his study of the Greek community in Egypt within the wider analytical framework of the Greeks in the diaspora and their role in the establishment of the modern Greek state. In the introduction to his thesis, for example, Hadziiossif states quite explicitly that his primary concern is to situate his research within what he refers to as the \textit{κοινωνικό φαινομενο} (community phenomenon) within modern Greek historiography.\textsuperscript{23} (Hadziiossif, 1980: iv-v) Hadziiossif's thesis, therefore, is primarily oriented towards making a substantive contribution to this branch of modern Greek historiography.\textsuperscript{24} The analytical orientation of the
present study, however, concerns itself primarily with the dynamics of Egyptian transformation during the nineteenth century.

As to the studies which focus on Cavafy, they are mainly concerned to situate the poet's literary production in the context of a socio-historical account of Alexandrine society during the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first three decades of the twentieth century. Thus, Stratis Tsirkas' two excellent studies, *Ο Πολιτικός Καβάφης* (The Political Cavafy) (1971), and *Ο Καβάφης και η Εποχή του* (Cavafy and his Epoch) (1973), attempt to make a contribution to the literary interpretations of Cavafy's poetry by reference to the socio-historical environment within which the poet lived and worked. This is also the case with such studies as those by Edmund Keeley, *Cavafy's Alexandria: Study of a Myth in Progress* (1977), Alexander Kitroeff, "The Alexandria We Have Lost" (1983) and Jane Lagoudis Pinchin, *Alexandria Still: Forster, Durrell, and Cavafy* (1989). These studies, however, offer different interpretations of Cavafy's poetry due to the fact that they also present distinctly different general socio-historical characterisations of the city of Alexandria during the poet's life. It is for this reason, therefore, that their discussion is being postponed until the conclusion of this study.
1. The doctoral thesis by Christos Hadziiossif, *La Colonie Grecque en Egypte, 1833-1856* (1980), under the supervision of Professor Nicolas Svoronos at the Sorbonne, constitutes the only systematic study of the socio-economic, political and cultural role and activities of the Greeks in Egypt during the nineteenth century. The only other extensive research on the Greeks in Egypt is Alexander Kitroeff's doctoral project, under the supervision of Dr Roger Owen at Oxford University, which focuses on the inter-war period during the twentieth century.

2. For a further elaboration of the limitations of such an approach see Tamás Szentes, *The Transformation of the World Economy: New Directions and New Interests* (1988), and especially chapter two.


7. For a critical discussion of Baran, Sweezy and Frank's work see John G Taylor (1979), and for a specific discussion of the limitations of the Dependency school see Tamás Szentes (1988), especially pp. 16-20.
8. For a conventional critique of such an approach, see A Macfarlane, "History, Anthropology and the Study of Communities" (1977), Margaret Stacey, "The Myth of Community Studies" (1969) and Bill Williamson, *Class, Culture and Community: A Biographical Study of Social Change in Mining* (1982). For a Marxist critique of this approach, see among others Talal Asad's "Introduction" in his *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter* (1973a), and Talal Asad, "The Concept of Rationality in Economic Anthropology" (1974).

9. The classic study by Philip Abrams, *Historical Sociology* (1982), is primarily concerned with the polarisation between history and sociology and incorporates a comprehensive critique of historical work which neglects the social context.


14. For a critique of this approach see, Ralph Coury, "Why can't they be like us ?" (1975), and Peter Gran, "The Middle East in the Historiography of Advanced Capitalism" (1975).


19. For a critique of this study see Pandeli M Glavanis, "Historical Interpretation or Political Apologia ? P J Vatikiotis and Modern Egypt" (1975).


21. This is particularly clear in the work of Peter Gran, Islamic Roots of Capitalism: Egypt 1760-1840 (1979), which is discussed in the second section of chapter one in this study.

22. See the extensive bibliography of such work by Evgenios Michailidis, Bibliography of the Egyptian Greeks, 1853-1966 (1966).

23. The article by Nikolaos Svoronos, "Le Commerce de Salonique au XVIIe siècle" (1956), initiated an interest among modern Greek historians on the role of the Greeks in the diaspora in the formation and development of the modern Greek state. Svoronos, who was the supervisor of Hadziiossif's thesis, continued his research in this direction which led to the publication of the classic study, "Esquisse de l'évolution sociale et politique en Grèce" (1969). This second article generated an extensive debate among modern Greek historians which led to the emergence of a distinctive body of scholarship within modern Greek historiography. It was the publication by N Psirouki of Το Νεοελληνικό Παροικιακό Φαινόμενο (The Modern Greek Community Phenomenon) (1974), which gave this branch of modern Greek historiography its name. Among the various publications, the work of K Tsoukalas, Εξάρχηση και Αναπαραγωγή (Dependence and Reproduction) (1977) and G Dertili, Το Ζήτημα των Τραπεζών (The Matter of the Banks) (1980) stand out as important contributions.

24. Hadziiossif claims that many of the studies in this branch of modern Greek historiography have failed to conduct systematic investigations of the various Greek communities in the diaspora. Thus, according to Hadziiossif, and here I also concur, the debate itself is characterised by generalisations about the common characteristics exemplified by all these different Greek communities in the diaspora. (Hadziiossif, 1980: v) Nicos Mouzelis, Modern Greece, Facets of Underdevelopment (1978) is an excellent example of the limitations and generalisations that exemplify this branch of modern Greek historiography. For a critique of Mouzelis, see Pandeli M Glavanis, "Underdevelopment in Greece" (1978).

It is with regards to this analytical issue that Hadziiossif makes his contribution and argues that "...leur evolution concrète a essentiellement été déterminée par le niveau et le rythme du développement économique et social des pays d'accueil." (Hadziiossif, 1980: vi) In this respect, of course, Hadziiossif's methodological approach has close similarities to the approach employed in the present study. This is despite the fact that he is concerned with a different problematic.
CHAPTER ONE

A Lacuna in Modern Egyptian History:
The Role of the Greek Community in Nineteenth Century Transformations

A particularly noticeable characteristic of the vast literature, in Arabic and other European languages, related to modern Egypt is the almost complete absence of any systematic or scholarly research on the Greek community. This is despite the fact that the Egyptian Greeks produced a plethora of essays, monographs and studies, some of which were also published in English, French and Arabic. This lacunae in the literature on modern Egypt invites us to question the reasons behind such a neglect of what could be considered as an important aspect of Egypt's modern socio-cultural and economic history. For as this study will attempt to show, the Greeks in Egypt were not only significant numerically, but they in fact participated in most of the important sectors of social, economic, cultural and political life. Various factors may account for this scholarly neglect of the Greeks in modern Egypt by the non-Greek scholars, three of which will be discussed below.

The most obvious factor relates to the availability of the material for scholarly use. The rest of this study, however, will demonstrate that this ought not be considered as an explanation because practically all the Greek communities, social institutions, chambers of commerce, etc. kept extensive records which are available to the present day in Egypt and open to any scholar who wishes to use them. In addition to these archival records, the Greeks produced hundreds of published books, pamphlets and newspapers. Professor Evgenios Michailidis' bibliography
records 3,300 books published in Egypt by the Greeks during the period 1853 to 1966. (Michailidis, 1966) Furthermore, from 1862 to 1972 the Greek community in Egypt published 360 newspapers in Greek and 43 newspapers in other European languages. (Michailidis, 1972) What is also remarkable and should be noted is that complete sets of most of these newspapers and practically all the books listed in Michailidis' bibliography are available in the various Greek public libraries in Alexandria and Cairo.

In terms of availability, for many of the scholars who study modern Egyptian history, the issue may not be related to access, but to the fact that the majority of this literature is in Greek. This, of course, may inhibit the non-Greek reading scholar, especially for those Europeans who have already had to learn Arabic and/or Ottoman Turkish in order to use the Egyptian archives. It should be noted, however, that the language barrier has not inhibited the many non-Greek literary scholars, whose focus on modern Greek cultural history encouraged them to devote extensive attention to the life and poetry of Cavafy. Cavafy, of course, wrote in Greek and lived and worked in Alexandria. (Keeley, 1977) Thus, it is possible to suggest that if scholars deem a particular subject worthy of study they may find means of overcoming the obstacles generated by the fact that the material is in a foreign language. The language problem, therefore, constitutes only a partial explanation, and has no relevance at all with regards to P J Vatikiotis, who is considered by most conventional scholars to be the leading figure in the field of modern Egyptian history. Vatikiotis, who is of Greek origin, lived and studied in Egypt and is fluent in Greek.

P J Vatikiotis, and especially his well known book, *The Modern History of Egypt* (1969), exemplifies quite well what may be considered as the
second factor which has contributed to the neglect of the role and contribution of the Greeks to modern Egypt. This is due to the fact that Vatikiotis' work highlights the main characteristics of the conceptual and analytical framework relied upon by most scholars in their accounts of modern Egyptian history. (Glavanis, 1975) This analytical framework, which has already been discussed in the introduction, attributes a central significance to political events and/or cultural history, while at the same time neglecting most other aspects of socio-economic reality. Furthermore, this framework invariably presents essentialist accounts of Egyptian history which derive predominantly from detailed discussions of either the activities of particular leading political personalities, Muhammad 'Ali or Nasir, and particular literary contributions by prominent intellectuals. The Greeks in Egypt, however, although numerous and active in the socio-economic sphere, participated only marginally in most political events and their cultural contributions were in Greek. Thus, it is only the few scholars of modern Egyptian history who attempted to produce a socio-economic interpretation of modern Egypt that incorporated in their studies references to the role of the Greek community.

Nevertheless, even when writing social and economic history many scholars, who focus on modern Egypt, rely heavily on British or French archival material for their accounts of particular events, which could be considered as the third factor contributing to the neglect of the Greeks in Egypt. The combination of the use of an essentialist analytical framework with the reliance upon European archival material has led many scholars inadvertently to present an apologia for European and especially British imperialist interventions in the affairs of Egypt. A majority of the Greeks in Egypt, however, by virtue of
their socio-economic situation challenged the European expansionist tendencies in that country, and, in particular, the British military occupation and economic domination of Egyptian society. Similarly, many of the publications produced by the Greeks in Egypt, such as books, newspapers and journals, presented accounts of particular events in modern Egyptian history which differ substantially from the account present in British or French archives. Thus, it could be suggested that a body of literature which exemplifies the theoretical and methodological approach indicated above would not be inclined to focus much attention on the activities and role of the Greek community. Furthermore, it should also be noted that this same body of literature has also neglected to pay any attention to the role and history of other socio-economic groups in Egyptian society, such as peasants, women, and workers. (Glavanis & Glavanis, 1983)

The result of this absence of scholarly work on the role and activities of the Greek community of Egypt has also contributed to the perpetuation of a characterisation of this community by reference to a prevalent stereotype of "the Greek" in Egypt. Of course, as is the case with most stereotypes it has not only been used extensively, but it has also constituted the primary justification for the absence of any scholarly studies on the Greeks in Egypt. Thus, any scholar wishing to embark on a study of the Greek community in Egypt is confronted by both the absence of any previous studies and the predominant "view" of the Greeks that derives from a stereotype rather than scholarly research. A good example of this situation is the otherwise excellent socio-economic study of modern Egyptian history, by an Egyptian economic historian, al-
Iqta' we'l-Ra'samiyya al-Zira'iyya fi Misr: Min 'Abd Muhammed 'Ali ila 'Abd 'Abd al-Nasir (Feudalism and Agricultural Capitalism in Egypt: From
the Era of Muhammad 'Ali to the Era of 'Abd al-Nasir), in which Salih Muhammad Salih dismisses the role of the Greeks in a matter of a few sentences and thus reproduces the stereotype. (Salih, 1979: 42) It is important, therefore, to examine briefly the origins and characteristics of this stereotype.

One of the first and most significant proponents of this stereotype is Lord Cromer, who "as British Agent and Consul-General from 1883 to 1907 was virtual ruler of Egypt." (Owen, 1965: 111) In the chapter on the Europeans of his two volume book, *Modern Egypt*, Cromer notes that "the Greeks are so numerous that they deserve consideration by themselves," and that "in Alexandria, which may almost be said to be a Greek town, a great many influential and highly respectable Greeks are to be found." (Cromer, 1908: 250) He then proceeds to focus exclusively on the section of the Greek settlers in Egypt which "consists of low-class Greeks exercising the professions of usurer, drink-seller, etc." (Cromer, 1908: 251) Given that Cromer occupied a very prominent position in modern Egyptian history, it is of interest to quote at some length his description of these "low-class Greeks". This is particularly so since by virtue of his "neglect" to discuss the other aspects and role of the Greeks in Egypt, and his almost exclusive focus on a characterisation of what he referred to as "the low-class Greeks", Cromer set out the outlines for the stereotype of "the Greek in Egypt" that has been reproduced by most scholars since then.

The Greek of this class has an extraordinary talent for retail trade. He will risk his life in the pursuit of petty gain. It is not only that a Greek usurer or a bakal (general dealer) is established in almost every village in Egypt; the Greek pushes his way into the remote parts of the Sudan and of Abyssinia. Wherever, in fact, there is the smallest prospect of buying in a cheap and selling in a dear market, there will the petty Greek trader be found. In 1889, I visited Sarras, some thirty miles south of Wadi Halfa (Upper Egypt). It was at the time the farthest outpost of the Egyptian army, and is situated in the midst of a howling wilderness. The post had only been
established for a few days. Nevertheless, there I found a Greek already selling sardines, biscuits, etc., to a very limited number of customers, out of a hole in the rock in which he had set up a temporary shop.

We may, therefore, give the low-class Greek credit for his enterprising commercial spirit. Nevertheless, his presence in Egypt is often hurtful. Whatever healthy moral and political influence remain untouched after the Turco-Egyptian Pasha, the tyrannical Sheikh and the fanatical "Alim" have done their worst, these the low-class Greeks seeks to destroy. He tempts the Egyptian peasant to borrow at some exorbitant rate of interest, and then, by a sharp turn of the legal screw, reduces him from the position of an allodial proprietor to that of serf. He undermines that moral quality of which the Moslems, when untainted by European association, has in some degree a specialty. That quality is sobriety. Under Greek action and influence, the Egyptian villagers are taking to drink. Mr Gladstone, in a speech which has become historical, once said that it would be a good thing if the Turks were turned "bag and baggage" out of Europe. This may or may not be the case. But there can be no doubt that a counter proposition of a somewhat similar nature holds good. It would be an excellent thing for Turkey and its dependencies if some of the low-class Greeks, who inhabit the Ottoman dominions, could be turned bag and baggage out of Turkey. (Cromer, 1908: 215-252)

The "low-class Greek", as portrayed by Cromer above, has been the basis of a characterisation of all the Greeks in Egypt in most of the scholarly literature. Furthermore, Cromer used this characterisation when he submitted his annual reports to the British Government, even though he himself acknowledged the existence of other classes of Greeks, referred to Alexandria as a "Greek town", and frequently socialised with prominent Greek merchant families in Alexandria and Cairo. (Oddi, 1911: 72-75) The inadequacy of relying on such a stereotype as a means of presenting the role and activities of an entire community, social class or ethnic group is self-evident. Furthermore, to attempt to dispute its validity on the basis of historical facts is also futile. Not only would this involve crude empiricism, but also because it is quite clear that a large number of Greek petty-merchants did also double as usurers and vendors of alcoholic beverages in the numerous Egyptian villages. Instead, this thesis will attempt to locate this type of activity within
the general process of socio-economic transformation that took place in Egypt during the nineteenth century. To what extent, it should be asked, was the availability of usury capital in the Egyptian villages a factor in contributing to the extensive cultivation of high quality cotton for the Lancashire textile mills and the development of British capitalism?

It should also be noted that there is an apparent contradiction between Cromer's characterisation of the activities of Greek usurers, who used legal methods to expropriate land from Egyptian peasants, and the widely accepted legitimation of the British military invasion of Egypt in 1882, and subsequent occupation of that country for several decades. This is because the legitimation of British intervention in Egypt is derived from a historical account which emphasises the fact that Egypt was unable to fulfil its debt obligations to European bond-holders. Thus, suggesting that it is justified for an entire nation to be seized by British imperialists "by a sharp turn of the legal screw", using Cromer's own words. Such issues, and their inherent contradictions, were in fact discussed at great length in various articles and books produced by the Greeks in Egypt subsequent to the publication of Cromer's book *Modern Egypt*. With regards to his disdain of the role of Greek usurers one writer notes

*Why did Lord Cromer not establish Agricultural Banks for his beloved fallahin (peasants)? The famous Banque Agricole, was established, but how did it relieve the pressures on the fallahin? The interest which they have to pay is 12 per cent, they have to mortgage their properties, and they also have to bear all the costs of the loan transactions. Most of those who did borrow from this bank are currently in danger of losing their property. The legal cases brought by the Bank against the borrowers number in the thousands.* [my translation] (Oddi, 1911: 73)
It is not the intention of this thesis to attempt to either justify the activities of the Greek usurers or to embark on an empiricist debate with the commonly used stereotype of "the Greek" simply because it was initially formulated by a colonial officer. A colonial officer, it might be added, who by virtue of his position as British ruler of Egypt could only perceive reality in such terms. What is important to debate, however, is why a stereotype formulated by a British Consul-General in order to characterise an entire community should have become the central feature in all subsequent scholarly accounts of modern Egyptian history. To embark on such a debate, of course, it is also necessary to examine the extent to which these usury activities in the Egyptian villages facilitated the appropriation of surplus from Egypt and its transfer to the British economy. Thus, it is necessary to examine in greater detail the nature of the transformation of Egypt's socio-economic and political structures, the role of Britain in this historical process which turned Egypt into a dependent "cotton plantation", and, of course, the specific role of the Greek community in Egypt. It is this which constitutes one of the primary concerns of this thesis.

In other words, this thesis is not engaged in an attempt to produce an alternative stereotype to that which predominates within the existing literature on modern Egypt. Instead it is hoped that a critical examination of the role and activities of the Greek community of Alexandria may in fact help initiate a scholarly debate which may produce a better understanding of the dynamics of modern Egyptian history. For as it has been noted above, and will be argued in greater detail in the subsequent chapters, the material from the Greek archives constitutes a valuable source for our understanding of the transformations experienced by the socio-economic and political
structures of modern Egypt. Thus, the rest of this chapter will present material from the Greek archives and publications which it is hoped can contribute both to an elaboration of the issues discussed above and aspects of Egyptian modern history.
I. Egypt's Agrarian Revolution: The Introduction of Cotton

A particularly useful and important body of material from the Greek archives and publications to be found in Alexandria is that which deals with the role of the Greeks in the production and circulation of cotton. The importance of this material emanates from the widely accepted view, argued in some detail in Chapter Three, that "from its introduction as a cash crop in 1820 onwards its influence over Egyptian economic development was profound". (Owen, 1969: xxiii) Furthermore, the role of the Greeks in Egypt in this aspect of Egyptian history was quite central. By far the most important part of their role was that of village usurer, and thus they provided the capital needed for the Egyptian peasants to devote almost their exclusive energy to the cultivation and production of cotton. (Crouchley, 1938; Issa, 1970; Mitwalli, 1974; O'Brien, 1966; Owen, 1969; Radwan, 1974; Richards, 1982; and Salih, 1979) Furthermore, the Greeks in Egypt also played a significant role in at least two other areas related to the cultivation and marketing of the cotton crop.

The first of these areas was the contribution of the Greeks to the development of new types of cotton. These types of cotton increased the overall value of Egyptian cotton exports. The main reason behind the significance of these new types of cotton is that Egyptian cotton from its original cultivation was a hybrid type which was developed from a mixture of Indian and Sudanese cotton types. The implications of Egyptian cotton being a hybrid crop was that every few years a new process of cross-fertilization was needed in order to sustain the yield per acre. (Politis, 1930: 140) Although the Greeks in Egypt developed numerous new types of cotton over a period of one hundred and fifty
years, the most important types were developed during the period 1850 to 1920 and they were the following (in chronological order):

**Table 1.1: Cotton Types Developed by Greeks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cotton type</th>
<th>Greek Inventor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gallini</td>
<td>M N Parachimonas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bamiah</td>
<td>Periclis Canavas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Psycha</td>
<td>Psychas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maschas</td>
<td>Maschas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ashmouni-Zagora</td>
<td>M N Parachimonas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Zagora</td>
<td>M N Parachimonas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mit-Afifi</td>
<td>Periclis Canavas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Afifi-Assili</td>
<td>A Parachimonas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nubari</td>
<td>A Parachimonas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Abbassi</td>
<td>Zafiri Parachimonas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Voltos</td>
<td>Voltos brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cassulli</td>
<td>N G Cassulli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Fathi</td>
<td>M Theodorou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Yannovitch</td>
<td>M Yannovitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sakel</td>
<td>John Sakelaridis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pilion</td>
<td>M N Parachimonas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Fouadi</td>
<td>M N Parachimonas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Politis, 1930: 145-159

The significance of these different types of cotton that were developed by the Greeks in Egypt can be grasped from Table 1.2.

**Table 1.2: Cotton Types Planted in the Delta, 1865-1927**  
(As a percentage of the total cotton crop cultivated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cotton Type</th>
<th>1865</th>
<th>1885</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashmouni-Zagora</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mit-Afifi</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbassi</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yannovitch</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakel</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afifi-Assili</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Politis, 1930: 171

The table above clearly highlights the fact that during the period 1865 to 1927 the vast majority of the cotton planted in the Egyptian Delta was developed by the Greeks. This point achieves even greater
significance when it is noted that the Delta region in Egypt is not only the most fertile area, but it is also the area where historically the bulk of Egyptian cotton has been produced by numerous small peasant households.

Among the different types of cotton developed by the Greeks in Egypt Sakel was to achieve the most prominent international reputation and thus it also produced the greatest value for the Egyptian economy and the merchants who traded in it. In order to highlight its premium in value terms it is worth comparing its average price with the average price of the Ashmouni cotton-type which was derived from the Jumel cotton-type. The Jumel cotton-type was the first cotton hybrid plant to be cultivated successfully in Egypt by a French textile engineer, Louis Alexis Jumel sometime between 1817 and 1819 in his Cairo garden. (Owen, 1969: 28) The Ashmouni which was the direct descendant of the Jumel was cultivated predominantly in Upper Egypt and maintained its supremacy in this region until 1883.

Table 1.3: Average Prices for SAKEL and ASHMOUNI, 1912-1928 (Prices in US Dollars per Cantar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SAKEL</th>
<th>ASHMOUNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>16.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>20.76</td>
<td>18.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>14.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>12.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>32.96</td>
<td>23.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>50.40</td>
<td>40.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>36.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919/20</td>
<td>100.06</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920/21</td>
<td>62.23</td>
<td>28.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921/22</td>
<td>37.61</td>
<td>26.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922/23</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>28.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923/24</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924/25</td>
<td>55.17</td>
<td>32.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925/26</td>
<td>34.66</td>
<td>24.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926/27</td>
<td>28.64</td>
<td>20.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927/28</td>
<td>37.72</td>
<td>27.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Politis, 1930: 175-176
The above table clearly confirms that throughout the period 1912 to 1928 Sakel maintained a premium over the second most important cotton-type, Ashmouni. It is of interest at this point to attempt to calculate the amount of additional value which Sakel contributed to the total of Egyptian cotton exports.

Table 1.4: Additional Value Contributed by Sakel to Total Cotton Exports 1913-1928
(Weight in KIantars, Premium & Value in Egyptian Pounds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COTTON-SEASON</th>
<th>WEIGHT (millions)</th>
<th>PREMIUM</th>
<th>ADDIT. VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1913/14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914/15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915/16</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916/17</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917/18</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>6,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918/19</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919/20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>17,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920/21</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>11,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921/22</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>5,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922/23</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923/24</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924/25</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>16,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925/26</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6,690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926/27</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>5,480,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927/28</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>6,090,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102,785,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Politis, 1930: 176-177

It is clear from the above table that Sakel contributed over one hundred million Egyptian pounds of additional value to the Egyptian cotton-export trade due to its premium price over the second most common cotton-type, Ashmouni, during the period 1913 to 1927.

The contribution of the Greeks in Egypt, however, was not restricted solely to the development of new cotton-types. In order that a new cotton-type may be put to commercial use, it first had to be accepted by the cotton-cloth manufacturers, which in those days essentially meant the Lancashire textile merchants. There is evidence to suggest that in general the cotton-cloth manufacturers in Lancashire were not too
cooperative with regards to the development of new cotton-types. Similarly, the sources indicate that there were two primary reasons behind the lack of cooperation from the cotton-cloth manufacturers. First, new cotton-types necessitated changes or adjustments to the machinery being used in the Lancashire mills which implied an increase in the costs of production. Second, new cotton-types which improved upon the quality of the cotton, such as Sakel, also implied an increase in the price of the raw cotton and thus a decrease of profit margins for the Lancashire textile merchants. (Filipou, 1945: 83 & Greek Chamber of Commerce, 1951: 43)

Politis quotes extracts from the correspondence between the Lancashire textile merchants and Lord Kitchener in Egypt in 1912 in which the former indicated in clear terms that the new cotton-types being developed by the Greeks were about to ruin the textile industry. Similarly, when Sakel was introduced into the market, the Lancashire textile industry named it the Pest of the Industry and placed sufficient pressure on the British colonial administrators in Egypt so that Mr Dudgeon, Secretary General of the Egyptian Ministry of Agriculture, took official steps to attempt to prohibit its cultivation. It was the strong reaction of the Egyptian large landlords, and especially Roukhdi Pasha, Prime Minister at the time, which saved Sakel. Egyptian landlords with large estates, of course, derived significant benefits from an increase in the value of the cotton crops being cultivated on their land. Any increase in productivity or quality of the cotton crop also permitted the landlords to increase rents paid by the small peasant households. (Politis, 1930: 160-61)

Greek cotton-exporters in Alexandria, who also stood to gain considerably from any increase in the value of raw cotton, were another
interest group which intervened quite forcefully on the side of those who were developing new cotton-types. Given, on the one hand, the uncooperative attitude of the Lancashire textile manufacturers and merchants, and especially their close links with the British colonial administrators in Egypt, and on the other, the large investments needed for the development of a new cotton-type, financiers willing to take on such risks had to be found. The sources indicate that village-based Greek entrepreneurs and usurers devoted considerable funds to the development of new cotton-types in the hope of "striking it rich". (Diakofotaki, 1973; Filipou, 1945; Livanos, 1939) Large investments for the development of important new cotton-types such as Sakel, however, and the impetus to extend their cultivation came from the Greek cotton-exporters in Alexandria. As Roger Owen points out,

The only way John Sakellarides, the discoverer of Sakel, could overcome the conservatism of manufacturers and ginners was to launch his cotton on the market by means of an arrangement with Choremi, Benachi and Co., who undertook to dispose of it through their many Lancashire connections. They also persuaded a number of cultivators to try the new type by distributing its seed among their Delta clients. It was only after Sakel had been introduced in this way that its properties began to be widely appreciated. (Owen, 1969: 222)

Choremi, Benaki and Co., a Greek cotton-exporting firm in Alexandria, was by far one of the largest firms in Alexandria for a considerable period of time. A detailed discussion of the activities and role of Benaki and Choremi will be presented in later chapters, but it is important to note here an example of their prominence. In 1911-12 they were the leading firm in cotton exports, followed by a British firm, Carver Brothers and Co. Ltd. During that year Choremi, Benaki and Co. exported a total of 238,893 kantars while their British competitor exported 230,170 kantars. What is of interest, however, is that even in the British market the Greek firm was able to hold its own. In this
same year Chorení, Benaki and Co. exported 98,752 kantars to Britain while the British firm exported 101,827 kantars. (Owen, 1969: 386)

The brief examples presented above indicate that there was an inherent economic alliance between Egyptian landlords, Greek cotton-exporters in Alexandria and village-based Greek entrepreneurs and usurers. This alliance was, of course, based on mutual interests, but as it developed in opposition to the interests, or as Roger Owen refers to it "the conservatism", of the Lancashire textile groups, it placed some members of the Greek community of Egypt on the side of the Egyptians in the developing contradictions between Egyptian landlords and British economic interests. In such a situation, it is not surprising that Lord Cromer, other British colonial officials and many scholars of modern Egypt, would fail to appreciate the "enterprising commercial spirit" of the "low-class Greeks". On the contrary, it would seem that, on the one hand, British colonial officials saw the Greeks in Egypt as potential "trouble-makers", and on the other hand, the scholars presenting apologia for British imperialism in Egypt neglected almost entirely any discussion of the Greeks. Thus, a wealth of material which could greatly contribute to our understanding, for example, of the manner in which the agrarian production process, especially with regards to the primary crop, cotton, was dramatically transformed during the period 1850 to 1930 has remained untapped.
II. The Foundation of Modern Egypt: The Era of Muhammad 'Ali

The preceding section indicated the importance of the economic activities of the Greek community of Egypt with regards to a particular aspect of modern Egyptian history, the cultivation and circulation of cotton. The Greek community of Egypt, however, played a role in the development and transformation of other aspects of modern Egyptian history throughout the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth century. Thus, it is of some interest to examine the importance of this material with regards to the scholarly interpretation of an entire period of modern Egyptian history.

The era of Muhammad 'Ali, founder of modern Egypt, which extends from the time he seized power in 1805 until his death in 1848 is a particularly crucial period of modern Egyptian history. As was indicated above, it was during this period that Egypt experienced some form of agrarian revolution, as a result of the introduction of cotton cultivation, as well as other socio-economic transformations which provided aspects of the framework for the development of modern Egyptian history. Furthermore, this period has also constituted the focus of many scholarly debates whose main arguments seem to suggest that there are at least two distinct approaches to the interpretation of this period specifically, and modern Egyptian history in general.

The predominant interpretation is exemplified by the work of Vatikiotis who locates this period within the context of a linear and essentialist conceptualisation of the dynamics of modern Egyptian history, when he notes that

...in surveying the development of modern Egypt from 1800 to the present one incontestable reality seems to characterize it. A soldier of fortune and ambitious autocrat, Muhammad Ali, in true Islamic-Ottoman style of his day, made Egypt into a modern state and permitted some of his subjects in his service to
acquaint themselves with the civilization and culture of Europe. In the period 1952–67, another soldier, but also radical autocrat, of the Technological Age, nurtured wider ambitions for his people with power at his disposal far greater than any of his predecessors ever possessed. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 449-50)

As already indicated in the introduction, it is within such a conceptualisation of modern Egyptian history that Vatikiotis, and most other scholars, then proceed to focus on what is perceived as the central issue in the interpretation of modern Egyptian history.

...the debates over the questions of traditionalism versus modern reform, Western civilization and European culture versus Islamic culture as related to the wider issue of the secular state and society...Two trends emerged simultaneously from the start: one traditional and therefore Arab in its linguistic emphasis and Islamic in its cultural preference; the other emulatively European. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 427)

Vatikiotis' view of the resolution of the debate on traditionalism versus modern reform with regards to era of Muhammad 'Ali is quite explicit when he emphasises that "while the influx of ideas in this period [1805 - 1848] was great, the institutional direction of socio-economic change did not really begin until foreign tutelage was direct and complete". (Vatikiotis, 1969: 161) Thus, it is not surprising that for scholars such as Vatikiotis, it is the brief presence of Napoleon in 1798 and especially the presence of the British, from 1882 to 1930, that constitute the sole periods during which the positive response toward Europe, modern reform rather than traditionalism, dominated Egyptian society. (Glavanis, 1975) It is within such an analytical framework that these scholars see the era of Muhammad 'Ali as constituting the foundation of modern Egypt.

The alternative interpretation is exemplified by those few scholars who adopt a "Leninist" and "generalised capitalist production" approach and see the era of Muhammad 'Ali as exemplifying the establishment of
capitalism in Egyptian society. Thus, this apparently alternative analytical framework also recognises the era of Muhammad 'Ali as constituting the foundation of modern Egypt, but with one important difference. These Lenin-oriented scholars locate the roots of the establishment of capitalism in intellectual developments within Egyptian society rather than in the borrowing from European civilisation and culture. This approach is quite clear in the work of Peter Gran and especially in his book entitled *Islamic Roots of Capitalism, Egypt 1760-1840*. (1979) As Afaf Lutfi al-Sayyid Marsot states in her forward to Gran's book, "Peter Gran's hypothesis that the output of the 'ulama' [Muslim religious scholars] marked 'developments in secular culture and were supportive of capitalism' is a challenge to past scholarship". (Gran, 1979: vii-viii) Gran, in fact, presents a provocative challenge to the bulk of Western scholarship, from Weber to Lukács, which locates the intellectual origins of capitalism solely in the West. Through his detailed study of intellectual history in Egypt, Gran is able to conclude that

...Islamic culture played a part in the main phases of modern world history. To allow, as is usually done, a watershed in world history like the industrial revolution of the eighteenth century to be constituted as a local event in English or French history is thus a regression to colonial history writing. A study of Egypt at the time of Shaykh Hasan al-'Attar (1760-1840) necessarily demonstrates these points. (Gran, 1979: 188)

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to attempt to evaluate this continuing debate within Middle East studies, but it suffices to note that both interpretations exemplify the same methodological and conceptual limitations. As already indicated in the introduction, such scholarship operates within a general conceptual framework where it is possible to distinguish methodologically between the "logic" of a social system – which is subordinate and needs to be "realised" – and its
origins and historical evolution - which is dominant and explicit. Thus, by distinguishing methodologically between diachronic and synchronic analysis, both Gran and Vatikiotis concentrate their research efforts on highlighting the "logic" - ethno-cultural essence - of a particular historical period through detailed studies of either the specific activities or the intellectual production of particular individuals. Having isolated this specificity they then relate it to the structural transformations being experienced by the society as a whole. The debate between the two interpretations, therefore, is conducted within the confines of functionalist empiricism where each proponent relies upon particular texts or specific activities by individuals in order to substantiate a broad interpretation of historical change.

Given the common methodological limitations inherent in both interpretations of this period of modern Egyptian history, it is not surprising that the debate was ultimately transformed into a Euro-centric versus an Egypto-centric interpretation of historical transformation. This is because, although Peter Gran relies extensively on Egyptian sources for his interpretation, he fails to distance himself from the prevalent Orientalist conceptual framework which characterises Vatikiotis' study and interprets the establishment of capitalism in terms of specific socio-cultural and intellectual developments. Whereas Vatikiotis sees such developments as originating solely in Europe, Gran locates a specifically Egyptian intellectual transformation which led to the establishment of capitalism during the era of Muhammad 'Ali. Capitalism, and especially industrial capitalism, however, does not identify itself with or rely upon a particular ethnic or cultural tradition. As Talal Asad has pointed out, "...it is precisely the
unique commitment of capitalism to maximise production that constitutes the historical rationale of European Imperialism - and hence the mode in which the histories of Third World societies have been assimilated into the histories of bourgeois society". (Asad, 1974: 214) Thus, without denying the specificity of the particular "histories" of any society or historical period, it is necessary to avoid "ethno-cultural" stereotypes in order to grasp the dynamics of historical transformation.

The material produced by the Greek community of Egypt, although reflecting the views of a single "ethnic" socio-cultural category, constitutes an invaluable source for an interpretation of the period 1805 to 1848 which does not have to rely upon "ethno-cultural" stereotypes. This is primarily due to the fact that the possibility of contrasting the specificity of Egyptian and European ethno-cultural entities is dismissed from the agenda when it is noted that the Greeks (Christian Europeans) and Muhammad ‘Ali (Muslim Egyptian) collaborated in their efforts to develop merchant capitalism in Egypt. Thus, it is useful to examine some of this material within the context of the general interpretation of this period of modern Egyptian history which was outlined in the introduction and contrasts with the interpretations of both Gran and Vatikiotis. This period was characterised by two important features: first, the consolidation of the Egyptian states' centralised and monopolistic control over the whole of the Egyptian economy, especially with regards to all market (circulation) activities; and second, the transformation of the Egyptian agrarian sector towards the production of cash crops and especially cotton.

By the start of the third decade of the nineteenth century, Greeks from Greece and other parts of the Ottoman Empire were already settled in Egypt and numbered about ten thousand. (Oddi, 1911: 149; Radopoulos,
The significance and role of these Greeks in Egypt can be grasped, at one level, from the fact that the newly independent Kingdom of the Hellenes (Greece) decided to establish its first consulate, in an Ottoman province, in Egypt in 1833. One of the main reasons that encouraged Greece to establish a Greek consulate in Egypt was in order to permit the Greek merchants to take advantage of the Capitulations. Thus, Greeks claiming Greek citizenship would no longer be considered Ottoman subjects and would be able to compete favourably with the other European merchants who already benefited from the Capitulations.

That commercial interests prevailed, in this decision by the Greek government, is also confirmed by the fact that it was Michalis Tossitsas who was appointed as the first Greek Consul-General in Egypt. This was despite the fact that there was strong Greek and Ottoman opposition to his appointment. Public opinion in Greece, for example, regarded Tossitsas as a friend and business partner of Muhammad 'Ali, and thus did not trust his allegiance to Greece. In fact, a Greek newspaper, Chronos, in Nauplion, seat of the Greek government at the time, published a lengthy article, on the 28th of July, 1833, suggesting that Tossitsas would rather serve his master, Muhammad 'Ali, than the interests of Greece. The article went on to remind its readership that it was the son of Muhammad 'Ali, Ibrahim Pasha, who had invaded Greece during the War for Independence, massacred several thousand Greeks and took many more as slaves back to Egypt. (Chronos, 1833) As to the Ottoman opposition, it revolved around the fact that Tossitsas was formally an Ottoman subject as he was born in Epiros which was still part of the Ottoman Empire.

Michalis Tossitsas, however, had strong support in his efforts to be appointed the first Greek Consul in Egypt. He secured the support of
Muhammad 'Ali himself. In fact, Muhammad 'Ali asked the Consuls of Austria, Britain and France to apply the necessary pressure on the new Greek government in order that Michalis Tossitsas would be appointed Consul-General in Egypt. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 316-7) This pressure seems to have worked, because Spiros Tricoupis, Greek Minister for Foreign Affairs, advised the King of the Hellenes, Othon, that

...as the commercial benefits that we will receive from the appointment of a Consul in Egypt depend entirely on the nature of the relations between this person and the Vice-Roy [Muhammad 'Ali], who controls all exports, it would seem that the nomination of Michalis Tossitsas to the post of Consul could be to our advantage. Furthermore, his personal fortune places him in a very convenient situation where he will not cost the government anything. [my translation] (Foreign Affairs, 36-1, 20/6/1833)

Nevertheless, having argued strongly for the appointment of Tossitsas, Tricoupis concludes his letter to Othon by noting that "...from the point of view of politics we can presume that at a given instance he [Tossitsas] could subordinate the interests of his country to those of his protector". [my translation] (Foreign Affairs, 36-1, 20/6/1833)

Commercial interests seem to have prevailed, however, for on the 4th of September, 1833, Spiros Tricoupis wrote to Muhammad 'Ali, and noted that King Othon, who wanted to appoint a person to safeguard the interests of those Greeks engaged in commercial activities in Egypt, had chosen Michalis Tossitsas. (Foreign Affairs, 36-1, 4/9/1833) Within a year the new Greek Consul had established sub-Consulates in six important coastal cities on the Mediterranean, three of which were Ottoman provinces: Alexandria, Rosetta, and Damietta in Egypt, Beirut in Lebanon, Tripoli in Syria and Jaffa in Palestine. (Politis, 1929: 209-10)

The establishment of the Greek Consulate-General and its six sub-Consulates was a particularly significant event when it is noted that most of Greece was still under Ottoman occupation, and relations between
Greece and the Ottoman Empire were strained. Thus, the establishment of the Greek sub-Consulates in Beirut, Jaffa and Tripoli, which provided Greek merchants in these cities with the right to take advantage of the Capitulations, was only possible because at the time they were under the jurisdiction of Muhammad 'Ali whose armies had reached as far as Konya in Turkey. In fact, with the Treaty of Hunkar Iskelesi in July, 1833, Muhammad 'Ali was made master of Syria, Lebanon and Palestine by the Ottoman Sultan. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 69) It is for this reason, therefore, that the stationery of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria had the following heading: Consulate General of Greece in Egypt and its Dependencies.

Furthermore, the establishment of diplomatic relations between the newly-independent state of Greece and Egypt signified a major transformation in the relations between the two nations. Only a few years earlier Muhammad 'Ali had sent his son Ibrahim with an expeditionary force to the Peloponesos to assist the Ottoman armies in suppressing the Greek war for independence. The expeditionary force conquered Crete and the Morea region in the Peloponesos, sent several thousands of Greeks to Egypt as slaves, but was eventually destroyed by the combined fleet of France and England in Navarino bay in 1827. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 69; Dakin, 1973: 172) That relations could improve so quickly between the two countries, and that Muhammad 'Ali would accept a series of Greek sub-Consulates on what was technically Ottoman territory, was to a large extent the result of the close relationship between Muhammad 'Ali and Michalis Tossitsas.

Muhammad 'Ali was born in Kavala, Eastern Macedonia, Greece, in 1769 which was part of the Ottoman Empire at the time. By the time he left with an Ottoman expeditionary force to regain control of Egypt from the
French in 1801, he was thirty-two years old and well-established as a prominent tobacco merchant in Kavala. What is particularly relevant to this discussion is the fact that most of his close commercial associates were Greek merchants from Northern Greece, and in particular Michalis Tossitsas. (Radopoulos, 1930: 2-3)

Michalis Tossitsas was born in Metsovon, Epirus, Northern Greece, in 1787, to a prosperous merchant family which specialised in both the manufacture and trade of furs. With his younger brothers, Theodoros, Konstantinos and Nicolaos, they inherited the family business and developed it so as to establish sub-branches in Kavala, Malta and Livourne. Eventually all three brothers and their sister Stamatia emigrated to Egypt with Michalis being the last to arrive in 1820. Theodoros and Konstantinos were the first brothers to arrive in Egypt in 1811, soon after Muhammad 'Ali had established his authority. (Alexandria Community Archives - Biographies) It was in Kavala, however, that Muhammad 'Ali first met the Tossitsas brothers and formed a particularly close relationship with the eldest, Michalis. A more detailed discussion of the activities of the Tossitsas brothers will be presented in subsequent chapters. At this stage it suffices to note that Michalis Tossitsas was not only the first Greek Consul-General in Egypt, but he was also the first President of the first Greek paroikia (colony) to be established formally in Egypt in 1843, in Alexandria. Michalis Tossitsas remained in Egypt in his capacity as Consul-General until the 29th. of May, 1854, when he had to return to Greece. This was due to the fact that after the death of Muhammad 'Ali, the Ottoman Sultan was able to exert the necessary pressure, during the Crimean war, that resulted in the disruption of the official diplomatic relations between Egypt and Greece. (Politis, 1929: 272)
Muhammad 'Ali and Michalis Tossitsas consolidated and developed even further their friendship and business relations when Tossitsas emigrated to Egypt. Muhammad 'Ali was not only the sole ruler of Egypt, but also the wealthiest merchant who provided Tossitsas with many commercial opportunities. In 1843, for example, together with a French citizen, they established the first modern state bank in Egypt, Bank of the Nation. Muhammad 'Ali invested the equivalent of four hundred thousand American dollars, Tossitsas invested two hundred thousand and Jules Pastré invested one hundred thousand. (Tsirkas, 1973: 41) Furthermore, Muhammad 'Ali appointed Tossitsas as general manager of all his private estates and made him responsible for the sale of all the agricultural products produced. (Alexandria Community Archives - Biographies) This was a particularly important position to be occupied by a Greek because, as Roger Owen notes, all foreign merchants "...were entirely dependent on Muhammad 'Ali's favours for their future prosperity". (Owen, 1969: 53) Thus, Tossitsas was able to assist many other Greek merchants who were also experiencing difficulties in dealing with Muhammad 'Ali's monopolistic control over the economy which prohibited foreign merchants from purchasing any agricultural products directly from the peasants. (Owen, 1969: 53-55)

In addition to Tossitsas, Muhammad 'Ali maintained close business relations with a number of other Greek merchants and financiers. The director of the state mint was a Greek named Athanasios Kazoulis who was also responsible for the state budget. Another business partner was Stefanos Zizinias who in fact held French citizenship at the time. This was to prove particularly beneficial to Egypt in 1825 when France prohibited the Toulouse ship-yards from selling Muhammad 'Ali battleships. Zizinias, as a French citizen, went to Toulouse, purchased
two battleships and donated them to the Egyptian navy. In compensation, Muhammad 'Ali gave Zizinias the property rights to an entire section of land just outside Alexandria which measured 15,625 acres. (Tsirkas, 1973: 41-42) By the 1850s this area, called Ramleh, had developed into an elite European suburb of Alexandria. To the present day the Greek community and the Greek Patriarchate own most of the property in this district which since the 1930s has become the commercial centre of the city.

What needs to be noted at this point is that it was during this same period that Muhammad 'Ali's armies, under his son Ibrahim, invaded Southern Greece, on behalf of the Ottoman Sultan, in order to suppress the Greek war for independence. In fact, the French ban on battleship sales to Muhammad 'Ali was a means of preventing him from re-supplying his armies in Greece. In the event, the two battleships bought by Zizinias were destroyed in Navarino the following year by the combined British-French fleet. Clearly it was not "ethno-cultural" loyalties which motivated men like Tossitsas and Zizinias, but the rationale of an expanding commercial and interest-bearing capitalism.

On his foreign commercial and diplomatic voyages Muhammad 'Ali always took some of his Greek business partners with him. In the Sudan military campaign of 1838, for example, whose main objective was the search for gold mines, Muhammad 'Ali was accompanied by Michalis Tossitsas, Pavlidis, who later converted to Islam and as Dranet Pasha achieved great prominence in Egypt, and Spiros Laskaris Bey, who was his personal physician. Michalis Tossitsas seems to have accompanied Muhammad 'Ali on most of his trips, including his diplomatic visit to
Istanbul in 1846. Even on his vacation trips to Malta, Muhammad 'Ali would always take with him Tossitsas and Zizinias. (Tsirkas, 1973: 42)

Given the close relationship between Muhammad 'Ali and a number of Greeks in Egypt, it is important to examine in some detail the motivation behind his military campaign in Greece on the side of the Ottomans. Generally speaking, most historians of modern Egypt or those who focus on the Eastern Question account for Muhammad 'Ali's military adventure in Greece in straightforward opportunistic terms. (Vatikiotis, 1969; Dakin, 1973) Muhammad 'Ali is generally characterised as an ambitious ruler who would grasp any possibility to expand his domain and thus he seized the opportunity of the Greek War of Independence to both placate his master, the Ottoman Sultan, and to expand his rule into Europe. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 68-69)

At one level, this account of Muhammad 'Ali's Greek adventure is plausible when it is noted that the Ottoman Sultan issued him with an Imperial firman (order) on the 10th of January, 1824, to send troops to help suppress the Greek revolution. In the firman Muhammad 'Ali was also promised, in return for his assistance, the province of Morea in Southern Greece. Thus, Muhammad 'Ali, according to the above account, responded to his opportunistic instinct and in July, 1824, under the command of his son Ibrahim, sent sixty-three battleships and one hundred ships carrying sixteen thousand soldiers to Greece. (Radopoulos, 1930: 61) This, of course, brought the wrath of all philhellenes in Europe and especially after the massacres in Messolonghi, Muhammad 'Ali was referred to as the "barbarian conqueror from the East" throughout Europe.
It is beyond the scope of this thesis to attempt to present an alternative interpretation to that prevailing among most historians. What is of interest, however, is the presentation of some of the material from the Greek community in Alexandria which would seem to indicate a greater degree of complexity than that which appears in most historical accounts. The most important body of material from the Greek community of Alexandria relates to the activities of the representative of the Philiki Etaireia in Egypt prior to and after 1821. The Philiki Etaireia was a secret organisation established by wealthy Greek merchants living beyond the jurisdiction of the Ottoman Empire, mostly in Russia, in order to organise and carry out the struggle to liberate Greece. One of the main activities of this organisation was to enlist the support of other Greek communities, also beyond the jurisdiction of the Ottoman Empire, with regard to the collection of food, weapons, money and volunteers for the forthcoming struggle. Thus, in 1820 the organisation sent Antonios Pelopidas to enlist the support of the Greek community of Egypt. (Radopoulos, 1930: 54)

The decision of the Philiki Etaireia to send a representative to Egypt is in itself quite interesting. After all, Egypt was nominally an Ottoman province and Muhammad 'Ali was an Ottoman governor who ruled in the name of the Ottoman Sultan. Thus, it would suggest that the organisation believed that either Muhammad 'Ali would be sympathetic to their cause, since he was keen to reduce the control of the Ottoman Sultan over his own activities, or that the contributions of the Greek community in Egypt would be so large so as to merit taking the risk of sending a prominent representative. Their expectations seem to have been justified on both counts. Within a few months of Pelopidas' arrival in Egypt he was able to send several ships carrying grain, one hundred and
fifty men and seventy-four thousand dollars to occupied Greece. Furthermore, the food and money were raised in public meetings and the ships departed with all the appropriate public fanfare. (Tsirkas, 1973: 40; Radopoulos, 1930: 54-57)

The freedom with which Pelopidas carried out his activities in Egypt can be substantiated even further by reference to the fact that on the 1st. of June, 1820, he proposed to the Philiki Etairia to permit him to seek the direct support of Muhammad 'Ali in his efforts to collect material assistance for the forthcoming Greek revolution against the Ottomans. The project he proposed, along with another prominent Greek merchant in Egypt named Kyriakos Tassikas, involved a commercial transaction where the two Greeks would obtain agricultural and manufactured products from Muhammad 'Ali for sale in the European markets and the profits would then be donated to the Greek revolutionary effort. Furthermore, a new merchant company would be established in Alexandria specifically for this purpose and, of course, Muhammad 'Ali would have to authorise the Egyptian Treasury to approve the scheme given that at the time, all international commercial transactions came under the control of a state monopoly. The proposal was approved by the Philiki Etairia and Muhammad 'Ali. As the commercial company was about to be established in Alexandria, however, the Greek revolution started and Pelopidas had to return to Greece. (Politis, 1929: 189)

It is worth noting at this point that the success of such an audacious scheme, even if it was not in fact implemented, owed a great deal to the special relationship between Muhammad 'Ali and the Tossitsas brothers. Having become aware of the activities of Pelopidas and Tassikas, on behalf of the Philiki Etairia, the Tossitsas brothers were concerned that such activities would undermine the privileges accorded to Greek
merchants in Egypt. Suspecting that the constant meetings at the house of another prominent Greek merchant in Cairo, Gregory M Zanos, would soon be discovered, they decided to inform Muhammad 'Ali. Thus, Constantinos Tossitsas went to see Muhammad 'Ali and in so doing betrayed the secret political activities of his fellow Greeks. Pelopidas and Tassikas were furious about the betrayal and according to another member of the Philiki Etaireia in Cairo, Antonis Psaros, went immediately to see Muhammad 'Ali. In fact, it was this particular incident which was used by the Greek newspaper Chronos in July 1833, in order to prevent the appointment of Tossitsas as Greek Consul in Egypt (see above). As Psaros recounts in his letter, Muhammad 'Ali was anything but concerned, demanded to know more about the aims and goals of the Greek revolution and agreed to support their commercial scheme. Once the activities of the Philiki Etaireia had received the support of Muhammad 'Ali, a committee was formed, headed by the Tossitsas and the Caloghlou brothers, in order to collect financial contributions and food for the Greek revolution. (Politis, 1929: 190-1)

Another indicator of Muhammad 'Ali's attitude towards the Greek War of Independence can be gleaned from his response to the Ottoman Sultan's firman, subsequent to the start of the revolution in March, 1821, that all property held by Greeks throughout the Empire should be be confiscated in order to prevent further material support from being sent. From the records left by a number of Greek merchants in Alexandria, it appears that Egypt was the only province where this firman was not obeyed. In fact, many of the Greeks indicate in their records that Muhammad 'Ali in fact provided refuge for the many Greek merchants, craftsmen, etc. who had to flee other parts of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, the records indicate that these refugees were not
only given refuge in Egypt, but were in fact assisted by Muhammad 'Ali to re-start their business activities. (Politis, 1929: 197-99; Radopoulos, 1930: 55-56; Tsirkas, 1973: 40) Of course, such an attitude towards "the enemies of the Ottoman Empire" generated political controversy within Egypt. This is clearly indicated in one of the dispatches sent by the French Consul-General in Alexandria, Drovetti, to his Minister of Foreign Affairs on the 22nd. of June, 1822, in which he notes that

*The enemies and antagonists of Muhammad 'Ali are attempting to light a fire on top of his head, accusing him of conspiring with the Greeks, because he has not ordered them to be massacred, because he gives them refuge and because he does not take any measures to prevent the trade of colonial goods which the Europeans [Greeks] export from Egypt to the islands of the archipelago.* [my translation] (Radopoulos, 1930: 55-56)

Clearly, Muhammad 'Ali saw the advantages in providing refuge to skilled craftsmen or experienced merchants as exceeding the political controversy generated by his policies. After all, he was in the process of "modernising" the Egyptian state and economy and as his main competitors were West European mercantile interests, he found himself having to rely upon the Greek merchants, even if they were technically at war with his sovereign.

Given the above indicators of Muhammad 'Ali's attitude towards the Greek revolution, it becomes necessary to account for his decision to obey the Sultan's request to send troops to Southern Greece. This is particularly so because subsequent to the disastrous military campaign in Southern Greece, Muhammad 'Ali seems to have resumed his pro-Greek attitudes. This is clear from his role with regards to the three thousand Greeks who were brought to Egypt as slaves by his soldiers and officers. Slavery was legal and widely practised in Egypt at the time, and one of the rights of soldiers and officers in any military campaign
was to capture adversaries and sell them as slaves. Thus, Muhammad 'Ali's role in helping liberate these slaves is worthy of consideration. This is particularly so with regards to the female slaves who had been sold to prosperous Egyptians and those who were kept in the palace of Ibrahim Pasha, son of Muhammad 'Ali.

The Greek Consular archives in Alexandria contain numerous items of correspondence between Michalis Tossitsas, Greek Consul-General, the Greek government and Muhammad 'Ali regarding this matter. (Politis, 1929: 211-21) What emerges from this correspondence is that Muhammad 'Ali applied sufficient pressure on his wealthy citizens and even on his son to ensure that when the Greek Consul-General or other wealthy Greeks offered to buy these Greek slaves, the former consented. It appears to have been a procedure that lasted a number of years as each slave had to be negotiated for individually and when the Egyptian owner refused, then Tossitsas had to appeal to Muhammad 'Ali, and so on. The correspondence also indicates clearly that the initiatives came from the Greek government which bombarded Tossitsas with requests for the liberation of particular slaves and provided him with detailed information such as name, age, place of birth, etc., and the necessary funds. (Foreign Affairs, 60; Politis, 1929: 218)

It should be pointed out, however, that this matter of assisting in the liberation of Greek slaves being held in Egypt quickly became part of a wider and more controversial political issue which also brought in the European Consul-Generals, this time on the side of the Ottoman Sultan. This involved Egypt's recognition of the newly independent Kingdom of the Hellenes (Greece) in 1833, discussed above, and the right of all Greeks in Egypt to be considered citizens of this state. The controversy developed almost immediately with the recognition, by
Muhammad 'Ali, of Michalis Tossitsas as a Greek citizen and the acceptance of his credentials as the first Greek Consul-General. Michalis Tossitsas was from Epiros which was still part of the Ottoman Empire and thus he was legally an Ottoman subject who did not have the right to represent Greece.

The attitude of Muhammad 'Ali towards his friend and business partner and all other Greeks residing in Egypt was to have a profound effect on the whole future of the Greek community. As will be shown in later chapters, the majority of the Greeks who had emigrated to Egypt in the first third of the nineteenth century came from either Northern Greece, still an Ottoman province, or other parts of the Ottoman Empire and thus were not entitled to Greek citizenship. Furthermore, this was one more instance where Muhammad 'Ali adopted a policy that contradicted the Ottoman Sultan's firman that only those Greeks who could prove that they originated in that part of Greece which had achieved independence. This was restricted to Southern Greece and a few islands at that time, and it was only their inhabitants who were entitled to be recognised as Greek citizens. (Politis, 1929: 219)

The significance of this issue was highlighted after 1842 when the European Consuls were able to start enforcing the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1838, discussed below in chapter three, which accorded all citizens of the signatory countries the right to carry out commercial activities throughout the Ottoman Empire and also set tariffs that favoured these citizens over Ottoman merchants. (Owen, 1969: 65, 71) Thus, had the Greeks in Egypt been considered Ottoman subjects, they would have been unable to benefit from either this treaty or the Capitulations which also established the Mixed Courts in 1876 and gave European merchants many privileges. (Owen, 1969: 86-7, 118, 158-9) Of
course, had Greeks been seen as Ottoman subjects, unable to compete with European merchants, they may have also followed a different emigration route from the Ottoman Empire such as the route followed by the Armenians who chose the United States of America. Thus, Muhammad 'Ali's policy of recognising all Greeks emigrating to Egypt, no matter where they originated from, as Greek citizens was a significant factor in making Egypt an attractive alternative, for Greek merchants and craftsmen, to the crumbling Ottoman Empire and the economically underdeveloped new Greek state.

It should be noted, however, that despite the fact that most European Consuls were quick to condemn Muhammad 'Ali for sending his troops to Southern Greece and to proclaim their philhellenic sentiments, they also felt it to be their duty to safeguard the rights of the Ottoman Empire by attempting to prevent the Egyptian state from recognising all Greeks in Egypt as Greek citizens. Subsequent to Muhammad 'Ali's death and the increase in European influence in Egypt, the Consuls repeatedly appealed to the Egyptian state to abide by the official policies of the Ottoman Sultan. (Politis, 1929: 231-244) This pressure from the European Consuls took the form of official European policy subsequent to the British military occupation of Egypt in 1882 and the appointment of Lord Cromer as British Consul-General. Cromer, who saw himself as a philhellenic, refers to the problem of Greek citizenship rights for Greeks in Egypt by noting that

The question of who is and who is not a subject of the King of the Hellenes is a never-ending cause of dispute between the Ottoman and Greek Governments. Under what conditions of birth and residence are the Greeks, who were born and bred outside Greece and who have only casually lived in that country, to be considered Greek subjects? It is needless to dwell on the details of this wearisome question. It will be sufficient to say that, in spite of the Egyptian authorities, (sic) most Greek-speaking Greeks generally manage to produce sufficient
Given the fact that Lord Cromer was de facto ruler of Egypt, it is not surprising, as later chapters will show, that many of the Greeks who emigrated to Egypt after 1882 also tended to be pro-British. Presumably this was due to the fact that they had to enlist the support of the British Consul-General in persuading the Egyptian authorities that they were entitled to be considered as Greek citizens.

The presentation above of some examples of the attitude of Muhammad 'Ali towards the Greeks in Egypt and the Greek Revolution against the Ottoman Empire suggest that Muhammad 'Ali's policy towards the Greeks was much more complex than most historians have made it out to be. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to attempt to present an alternative interpretation, but it suffices to note that the above examples suggest the need for an alternative framework within which to evaluate Muhammad 'Ali's attitude towards the Greeks. The predominant analytical framework which concentrates on ethno-cultural issues views Muhammad 'Ali simply as an "Eastern Barbarian" intent on suppressing the Greek Revolution in order to satisfy his ambition to expand his empire into Europe. Instead, it may be more fruitful to highlight Muhammad 'Ali's efforts to "modernise" the Egyptian state and develop a mercantilist economic structure, albeit under monopolistic state control. For, it should be clear that an ethno-cultural approach, whether it be pro-Islam (Gran) or an apology for European imperialism (Vatikiotis), which posits Europe against Islam cannot account for the relationship between the Greeks (Christian Europeans) and Muhammad 'Ali (Muslim Oriental).

It should also be noted, however, that an examination of the material produced by the Greek community in Egypt, with regards to the
relationship between Muhammad 'Ali and the Greeks, may also suggest an alternative general interpretation of the entire Muhammad 'Ali era. Thus, it may be possible to avoid both Vatikiotis' "soldier of fortune and ambitious autocrat" and Gran's "Islamic roots of capitalism" styles of interpretation which focus on ethno-cultural issues and fail to grasp the dynamics of Egypt's transformation during this period. This possibility derives from the fact that the Greek material provides alternative accounts of particular events in modern Egyptian history. These alternative accounts can then be contrasted to those accounts prevalent in European archives and so permit a new interpretation of the same events. In order to elaborate on this point material from the Greek community in Alexandria will be contrasted to that from European archives with respect of the events of 1882. This is the focus of the next section.
III. The British Military Occupation: The Events of 1882

The preceding examples of the importance of the material from the Greek archives and publications relate to a period of modern Egyptian history during which the Greek community played a prominent role in the affairs of the Egyptian State. Thus, it is not difficult to appreciate the significance of this type of material for a better understanding of modern Egyptian history. This material, however, is also important with regard to areas and issues where the Greeks in Egypt may have only played a secondary or peripheral role. One such example is the attempt by historians to analyse the events that preceded and followed the military occupation of Egypt by Britain in 1882. The causes that led to the military intervention of Britain and the subsequent occupation of Egypt for over sixty years are still the subject of scholarly debates amongst Middle East scholars.

The predominant interpretation within this debate views the events leading up to the military invasion of 1882 as a series of financial entanglements by Khedive Isma'il (ruler of Egypt) and historical "accidents" which unwittingly led Britain to intervene militarily. Vatikiotis, a leading proponent of this interpretation notes that "the financial entanglements of the Khedive, however, moved with relentless complexity to a political crisis in the years 1876-9. Instead of saving him, his constitutional measures opened a Pandora's Box from which emerged the first Egyptian rebels". (Vatikiotis, 1969: 129-30) This interpretation then proceeds to focus on the activities of the army rebels, led by Colonel 'Urabi, who it is also suggested were "encouraged by the French Consul-General". (Vatikiotis, 1969: 148)
Vatikiotis and other proponents of this interpretation view the actual military intervention of Britain, in what was otherwise an Egyptian matter, as deriving from two specific developments: The first was the usurpation of state power by Colonel 'Urabi, one of the few Egyptians amongst the Turkish officers in the Egyptian army, which threatened the integrity of the Ottoman Empire since Egypt was still nominally an Ottoman province. This attracted the "concern" of the British government which was "devoted" to maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. (Blunt, 1907; Burns, 1928; Holt, 1968; Vatikiotis, 1969) Second, these scholars point out that, "Orabi was presented as a hero who could rid Egyptian Muslims of foreign control and free them from a heavy debt. Such publicity excited further the frustrations of the poor, ignorant masses and egged them on to commit irresponsible acts of hooliganism". (Vatikiotis, 1969: 155)

Vatikiotis then proceeds to note that "in this tense atmosphere, communal troubles broke out in Alexandria which culminated in an armed clash between Europeans and Muslims on 11 June, [1882] with considerable loss of life by both communities". (Vatikiotis, 1969: 155) It was in order to safeguard the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, prevent any further clashes and to protect the Europeans that led to "an unexpected British military operation that sealed the fate of the Orabists". (Vatikiotis, 1969: 157) British ships anchored off Alexandria harbour bombarded the city from 7 am to 6 pm on the 11th. of July, 1882. (Tsirkas, 1973: 110-11) One month later Sir Garnet Wolseley and his twenty thousand troops landed in Alexandria with orders "to crush the Orabists by every means and the campaign of clearing the country of rebels began in earnest". (Vatikiotis, 1969: 158) The British army remained in Egypt until the Suez crisis of 1956. According to this
interpretation, during this period the British carried out an extensive policy of "...fiscal, administrative and judicial reform...", (Vatikiotis, 1969: 178) which was "...essential to Egypt's survival and well-being." (Vatikiotis, 1969: 181)

A small number of scholars have presented a very different interpretation of the events of 1882. Rather than attempting to discredit the facts, this alternative view attempts to present a different analysis of the motives behind the British military occupation of Egypt within an analytical framework of a critique of British imperialism. Theodore Rothstein, a prominent British anti-imperialist and a leading exponent of this alternative interpretation exemplifies the argument in his massive and detailed volume entitled, Egypt's Ruin. A Financial and Administrative Record, (1910) when he notes that

Of course, the starting point of all the trouble and the real issue for which the war was to be waged, that is, the interests of the bondholders, were for the moment forgotten, and those whose business it was to know did their best to conceal them...[leading to]...the last stages by which England succeeded in...reaching her goal - the single-handed occupation of Egypt. (Rothstein, 1910: 220-21)

Nevertheless, in presenting this alternative interpretation of the events of 1882 these scholars have also uncritically reproduced many of the "facts" that are central to the predominant interpretation and thus inadvertently undermined their own arguments. For example, it is surprising to read in Rothstein's otherwise critical account of these events that

The "riot" began at about one o'clock and...after a general mêlée the riot developed into a massacre of Europeans, in which several hundred lost their lives and as many were wounded, including Mr Cookson and some other Consuls. All this time the police either did nothing or took part in the massacres...The Commandant of the garrison...appearing at five, soon quelled the "pogrom". (Rothstein, 1910: 198)
A similar reproduction of such facts about "the massacre of Europeans" is also to be found in an otherwise excellent and critical study by Elinor Burns, entitled *British Imperialism in Egypt.* (1928) In this study, Burns, herself a prominent British anti-imperialist scholar and activist, notes "...that a massacre of Christians at Alexandria was secretly organised". (Burns, 1928: 11)

An unexplained aspect of this uncritical reproduction of so-called facts by practically all the scholars who have written about the events of 1882 in Egypt is that detailed accounts that disputed the so-called "massacre of Europeans" were collected by a British eye-witness, the poet Wilfred Scawen Blunt, and sent immediately to Sir Randolph Churchill who divulged them in the House of Commons in 1883. (Foreign Office, 1884) Of particular interest is also the fact that these accounts appear prominently in Blunt's own book entitled, *Secret History of the English Occupation of Egypt,* (1907) and it was Blunt who wrote the introduction to Rothstein's book. In other words, although an alternative account of "the massacre of Europeans" was readily available in the form of a published book and later in the Public Record Office, practically none of these scholars even refer to it.

It could be argued that scholars adopting the predominant interpretation would find it easier to "ignore" such accounts as they would undermine their overall apology of British imperialism in Egypt. Similarly, it could also be argued that such scholars as Rothstein and Burns had as a primary motivation the critique of British imperialism rather than the presentation of an alternative account of modern Egyptian history. After all, their principal argument was with the "real" motives of the British military occupation of Egypt and thus their account is adequate. Accounts of "the massacre of Europeans", however, is of considerable
significance to modern Egyptian social history and to the historical "image" of the Egyptian people.

It is for this reason that the plethora of material on this event, substantiating Blunt's accounts, that is held in the Greek archives and publications in Alexandria needs to be examined. After all, the Greeks in Alexandria who numbered approximately 25,000 in June, 1882 (twenty thousand residents and about five thousand who had come from the surrounding villages for the summer vacation) were also first-hand witnesses and as the material shows participants in the events of the 11th. of June, 1882. The Greek material from Alexandria relating to the events of 1882 can be subdivided into two broad categories. First, the material from the Greek Consular archives which is generally favourable to the British perspective, but also quite revealing as to the British intentions. Second, the material produced by the Greek community itself (memoirs, newspapers, Greek hospital records, etc.) which is generally critical of the British accounts of 1882, and very detailed with regard to the daily events in the city during this period. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to present a detailed and alternative interpretation of the events of 1882, but it suffices to indicate in a general manner the type of material available.

The first item of interest in the Greek Consular archives of Alexandria is the material relating to the participation of Greece in the events of 1882 with a naval attachment. Nicolaos Scotidis, Greek Vice-Consul in Alexandria, quotes extracts from the correspondence between the British government and Charilaos Tricoupis, Greek Prime Minister, and Rangavis, Greek Consul-General in Alexandria. (Scotidis, 1883) Scotidis' account clearly indicates that after the arrival of the joint British-French naval attachments outside the port of Alexandria on the 5th of May 1882,
pressure was put on the Greek Prime Minister from the British and Rangavis to send a Greek naval attachment. The reason used by both the British government and Rangavis was that the Greeks in Alexandria were under threat from the Egyptian mobs. Eventually the Greek Prime Minister succumbed to the pressure and two battleships, the *Hellas* and the *Gheorghios*, arrived in Alexandria on the 23rd. of May, 1882. (Scotidis, 1883: 41)

The significance of the participation of Greece in the events of 1882 has to be examined in the context that other European powers, such as France, suspecting the alterior motives of Britain were threatening to withdraw their warships and in fact did so prior to the bombardment of Alexandria. Thus, the presence of the two Greek battleships permitted Britain to sustain her claim that this was a "joint European" operation in order to protect the Europeans in Alexandria. The absurdity of the Greek participation, in what was clearly a British operation, was also noted by a French observer in Alexandria, John Ninet, who stated that "...they [the British] felt it necessary to also add some ridiculous samples of the Greek navy". (Ninet, 1884: 84)

The presence of the two Greek battleships, however, was not as absurd as it might have appeared at first sight. The Greek sailors performed an invaluable service for the British. First, they were able to use the long-standing friendship between Greeks and Egyptians in Alexandria and thus transport guns and ammunition from the battleships to the Greek Consulate, for distribution to the Europeans, without raising any suspicions. Secondly, wearing civilian dress they were able to circulate freely within the city by merging with the other thousands of Greeks who were living there. (Tsirkas, 1973: 98) Thus, the Greek
sailors played a central role in the preparation of the British military invasion of the city of Alexandria.

Furthermore, the Greek Consulate in Alexandria assisted British intentions not only by distributing arms to the Europeans, but also by propagating actively the danger of a "massacre of Europeans". In early June, 1882, the Greek Consul-General made a formal approach to all his European colleagues in Alexandria. In a dispatch to Greece the purpose of this approach was revealed.

_The diplomatic representation of Greece has suggested to the various official circles the necessity of organising a plan for the protection of the Europeans in the case of an attack by the Arabs; but the suggestion was rejected as the danger was not seen as imminent as of yet. [my translation] (Scotidis, 1883: 49)_

The officials who rejected the appeal of the Greek Consul-General were the Consuls of Russia, the United States of America, Germany, Austro-Hungary, France, Italy, Sweden and Holland. (Tsirkas, 1973: 99) In other words, practically all the other Consuls who had not been duped or pressured by the British. The Greek Consul-General, however, did not give up and announced that he had information that a wealthy Egyptian merchant, Musa al-'Aqqad, had purchased large quantities of wooden sticks. A few days later the Greek Consul-General called for the landing of British and Greek marines in Alexandria in order to prevent the eminent "massacre of Europeans". (Tsirkas, 1973: 99; Xenos, 1957: 21) It should be clear from these few examples that the Greek Consul-General was clearly attempting to generate a climate that would suit British interests. Thus, a detailed study of the Greek consular archives, which is beyond the scope of this thesis, might well bring to light further information regarding the events of 1882.
Clearly, the few examples of the activities of the Greek Consul-General, presented above, do not in themselves suggest that there was a Greco-British conspiracy to "create a massacre of Europeans" in order to justify the military occupation of Egypt by Britain. These snippets of information simply suggest that the Greek state and its representative in Alexandria were active participants in the events of 1882. It is for this reason that it is necessary to examine the second category of material from the Greeks in Alexandria, the material from the Greek community.

Of particular interest is the Greek newspaper *Elpis* (Hope) that was published by the Alexandria Greek Workers Association. In the issue number 2,348 that was published on the 11th. of January, 1882, they record the minutes of a general meeting of the Association that was held on the previous day. It is clear from these minutes that the Association unanimously passed a resolution which condemned the scare-tactics being propagated by the British press regarding the eminent threat of a "massacre of Europeans" by Egyptian mobs and that the Greeks and Italians in Alexandria were threatening to loot and burn Egyptian villages in retaliation. The resolution also encouraged its members to help dispel these false rumours propagated by the "agents" of the British. (*Elpis*, 11/1/1882 & Xenos, 1957: 20) Clearly a detailed examination of the many newspapers and journals produced by the various Greek associations and organisations in Alexandria in 1882 would produce additional information regarding the manner in which at least one European community perceived the imminent threat of "a massacre of Europeans".

The memoirs and books written by several Greeks who were officers in the Alexandria police force at the time of the 1882 events are also of
interest. In order to indicate their usefulness two examples will be presented. The first concerns the relationship between the Head of the Police force, Lutfi Pasha, and the British. On the day of the "massacre" the European Consuls, except for the British and Greek consuls, sought an appointment with Lutfi Pasha in order to ask him to send the Police force to stop the rioting. Lutfi Pasha managed to avoid seeing the European Consuls for several hours and when he did see them, he pointed out to them that his police force was not in a position to deal with such disturbances and so he had ordered them to stay in their barracks. The European Consuls then asked him to call upon the Egyptian army which had six thousand men under the command of Isma'il Daud and Tulba Pasha in the city and were willing to offer their assistance. Once again, the Head of Police refused, noting that due to the prevailing atmosphere, he could not trust the sentiments of the Egyptian soldiers towards the Europeans. It was not until five in the evening that Colonel 'Urabi, who was in Cairo at the time, was informed of the events and ordered Tulba Pasha to restore order in Alexandria. Tulba Pasha and his Egyptian soldiers restored order within twenty minutes. (Tsirkas, 1973: 103) It should also be noted, that the telegraph service from Alexandria to Cairo was operated by the British Eastern Company and that the Consuls had made several visits to its offices before the telegram to 'Urabi was actually sent.

In another account of the events of the day of the "massacre", it is noted that the Greek consulate had employed a number of Greek trouble-makers in order to ensure that the rioting spread throughout the European quarters. This was noted by a number of Greek police officers who had left their barracks, contrary to the orders of the Head of Police, and had stationed themselves at the entrance of Friar street.
which was inhabited predominantly by Greeks. There they prevented the Greek trouble-makers from the Greek Consulate from entering the street and starting a riot. (Tsirkas, 1973: 103) This account is corroborated by the account of the Greek Vice-Consul, Scotidis.

It was five in the afternoon and no soldiers had yet arrived. Only a few European police officers with the official translators of the Police Force were standing there. Unable to control the rioting of the Egyptian mobs they concentrated on preventing [the movement of] Europeans coming from the Consuls Square who wanted to go and help their relatives and friends who were in danger in Friar street. [my translation] (Scotidis, 1883: 52)

It is possible to deduce from the above accounts that the Europeans being prevented by the European police officers were the trouble-makers conscripted by the Greek Consulate. It is also possible to conclude, from the above example, that the Greek community in Alexandria played different roles during the events of 1882, and thus their records would constitute a useful source.

Another important source of information concerning the events of that day are the records of the Greek hospital in Alexandria and the accounts written by some of its Greek doctors who were present in Alexandria on the day of the "massacre". A superficial examination of this material suggests an interpretation of events which would seriously challenge the prevailing views in two ways. First, the hospital records indicate that the majority of the Europeans who were brought to the hospital had been shot in the head or the shoulders and at angles that would imply that they were shot from balconies or windows. (Tsirkas, 1973: 102; Irofilos, 1948: 48) The type of wounds suffered by the Europeans is also mentioned by the French observer, John Ninet, who corroborates the information from the Greek hospital records. (Ninet, 1884: 120) This type of information would indicate that many of the Europeans were
injured or killed from bullets fired by other Europeans who stood on their balconies and windows and shot at the crowds in the streets. This is further confirmed by the fact that it was only Europeans who possessed arms while Egyptians had long wooden sticks, and that the riots took place in the European quarters where only Europeans would have access to the balconies and windows. (Xenos; 1957: 20)

The account of Georghios Zangarolas, a Greek doctor and Director of the Greek Hospital in Alexandria, is also an important source of information on the events of that day. Zangarolas was a member of a committee that prepared an account of the injuries and deaths from all the hospitals in the city. According to his account, the committee located forty-nine persons who had been killed on that day. Thirty-three were Europeans of different nationalities, two were Greeks, eleven were Egyptians and three were Turks. Zangarolas lists the names of the forty-nine persons killed and notes that the two Greeks were the captain of a merchant ship, Kilamidas, and a merchant called Nestoras Pizanis. (Scotidis, 1883: 67; Irofilos, 1948: 48)

It is possible that the above figures would be more accurate for the Europeans than for the Egyptians as it would be expected that any European who was injured would have been taken to one of the city hospitals while this is not necessarily the case with poor Egyptians who may have been injured. Thus, it is interesting to note that in another part of Zangarolas' account he notes that there were about two hundred persons who were killed on that day, but only forty-nine were taken to the city hospitals. (Irofilos, 1948: 48) This would suggest that about one hundred and fifty Egyptians, in addition to the eleven taken to the hospitals, were also killed. The figure provided by John Ninet for the Egyptians killed on that day is one hundred and sixty-three. (Ninet,
Thus, it can be concluded that thirty-five Europeans and about one hundred and sixty-three Egyptians were killed on the day of "the massacre of the Europeans" in Alexandria. This is in addition to the fact that many of the Europeans were probably killed by their fellow Europeans who panicked and shot into the crowds. This is a very different account from Rothstein's claim, quoted above, that there was "a massacre of Europeans, in which several hundreds lost their lives and as many were wounded".

It is possible to conclude from the above presentation of some of the material from the Greek archives and publications in Alexandria that this material is of some significance in any attempt to understand the dynamics of modern Egyptian history. The examples presented above suggest a very different interpretation of a particular event in modern Egyptian history. Furthermore, they also suggest that the Greek material in Alexandria is useful because even in an area where the Greeks of Alexandria were not the primary actors, such as the events of 1882, their large numbers and distribution in different walks of society, (workers, doctors, policemen, consular officials, etc.) made them important participants in or at least observers of events.

This chapter, through the three examples presented above, has tried to indicate that the Greeks in Egypt did play a role which should not be ignored in an attempt to understand the dynamics of modern Egyptian history. In fact, the above discussion also suggests that it is only the acceptance of Lord Cromer's stereotype of the Greeks in Egypt and a pro-British account of modern Egyptian history which permits scholars to ignore the role played by Greeks. Nevertheless, the purpose of this chapter was not to substitute one stereotype of the Greeks in Egypt with an alternative stereotype. Instead, the central concern of this chapter
was to suggest that not only is the existing stereotype inadequate, but that any approach that relies upon ethno-cultural criteria would fail to grasp the dynamics of modern Egyptian history. Admittedly, the few and brief examples presented in this chapter do not, in themselves, constitute either an alternative interpretation of modern Egyptian history or for that matter a comprehensive account of the role and activities of the Greeks in Egypt's modern history. Although such a task is beyond the scope of one study it is hoped that the following chapters, which will examine in some detail the activities and historical development of one particular Greek community, namely that of Alexandria, will constitute a contribution towards such a task.
1. The classic two volume study of the modern history of the Greeks in Egypt by Athanase G Politis, entitled *L'Hellenism et l'Egypte Moderne,* was published simultaneously in Greek and French in 1929 and 1930 in Alexandria and Paris. The French version is available in most university libraries in western Europe and has been used in this study. Furthermore, the Alexandria Greek Evgenios Michailidis published in 1966 a bibliography of all material published by the Greeks in Egypt from 1853 to 1966. This bibliography, *Bibliografia ton Ellinon Aiguptiotan,* 1853 - 1966 (Bibliography of Greek Egyptians, 1853 - 1966) lists over three thousand entries and also includes a special section which records the publication of over one hundred books in either English or French. Professor Michailidis also published in 1972 a record of all the newspapers that were produced in Egypt by the Greeks, entitled *Panorama* which also includes forty-three newspapers that were published in European languages.

2. This approach which is characteristic of most studies by Orientalists and contemporary scholars of the Middle East has already been discussed in the introduction. An elaborated and critical discussion of this approach can be found in the journal *Review of Middle East Studies,* volumes one, two and three, published in 1975, 1976 and 1978 respectively. It is also discussed in "The Sociology of Agrarian Relations in the Middle East: The Persistence of Household production" (1983), by K R G Glavanis and P M Glavanis, pp. 4-9.

3. The classic example is the work of Roger Owen, entitled *Cotton and the Egyptian Economy, 1820 - 1914,* which was published in 1969. Nevertheless, even this study makes only occasional references to the Greeks and since then neither has Roger Owen or most other modern economic historians of Egypt pursued any research on the role of the Greeks in Egypt. The only exceptions being Hadziiossif (1980) and Kitroeff (1983).

4. See for example, "Historical interpretation or political apologia ? P J Vatikiotis and Modern Egypt" (1975), by P M Glavanis, pp. 63-78.

5. This book by the Earl of Cromer was published in 1908 and has influenced a number of scholars writing on Egypt. Even critical Egyptian economic historians such as Ra'uf 'Abbas Hamid in his *al-Nizam al-ijtim'i fi Misr fi zill al-milkiyyat al-zira'iyya al-kabira,* 1837 - 1914 (The social system in Egypt under the influence of the large landowners, 1837 - 1914), relies extensively on Cromer. For a discussion of Hamid's work, see Glavanis and Glavanis, 1983: 12-4.

6. The Capitulations were a series of commercial treaties signed between European powers and the Ottoman Empire which accorded European merchants a number of privileges such as reduced tariffs, the right to be prosecuted only according to their respective legal codes in their own consulates, etc. The merchants who benefited from the Capitulations were those who were citizens of the following European countries: the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Belgium, Britain,
Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Holland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, and the United States of America. For a detailed and critical discussion of the Capitulations see Hossam M Issa, *Capitalisme et Sociétés Anonymes en Égypte* (1970).
The pattern of Greek emigration to Egypt precedes the historical period under consideration by this thesis, the nineteenth century, by several centuries. The Greek immigrants, however, who established the Greek community of Alexandria, and thus constitute the focus of this thesis, were part of a particular historical process whose origins may be located in the eighteenth century. It is for this reason that it is necessary to present a brief account of this historical process which, it is hoped, will assist in a better understanding of Greek emigration to Egypt in the nineteenth century.

The first modern Greek colonies outside Greece may be dated from as early as 1514, when Greek merchants established a community in Anacona. (Frangos, 1973: 91) An important characteristic of these early communities was the predominance of merchants to the extent that many of them could be regarded as merchant colonies. Furthermore, many of these communities were developed around trading houses that had been established by Greek merchants who left the Ottoman Empire for the commercial centres of Europe.

Thousands of Greeks left the [Ottoman] Empire to establish trading houses in the emporia of Europe. These became the nuclei of Greek communities (koinotites), created to complement not only the economic requirements of their members but to fulfil their social and cultural needs as well. When the Greeks of Anacona were granted special trading privileges, they were also permitted to establish their own Greek Orthodox church. The koinotita of Trieste was called a 'legally
Thus, it appears that these early Greek communities in Europe were also characterised by a particular type of socio-cultural and economic organisation. These particular characteristics are exemplified in the organisation and activities of the Greek merchant community of Sibiu (Hermannstadt) in Transylvania.

Greek trading houses had been established there as early as 1545 and in 1636 the Greeks were granted the right to establish a merchant company. In addition to trading privileges, the company was permitted to elect its own officials to govern the affairs of the company and the affairs of the community. In effect, the company became the institutional basis of the koinotita. Its president was called proestos (notable), a title used by Peloponnesian oligarchs. In 1640 the company hired a priest to conduct baptisms, weddings and funerals. By 1776 a teacher was added to the company's payroll and a school house was built several years later in 1797. A substantial entrance fee and annual dues were required of its members. An important feature of this and other communities of the diaspora is that the merchant houses were family-based enterprises. Furthermore, in Sibiu, by the end of the eighteenth century, the directorship of the company, the main constituents of which were the heads of other family houses, became the virtual property of one family, the Safranos, which was among the oldest and wealthiest in the city. (Frangos, 1973: 91-2)

The development of this Greek commercial bourgeoisie, beyond the confines of the Ottoman Empire, coincided with the dramatic decline of the Ottoman Empire itself. (Islamoğlu and Keyder, 1977; Lewis, 1961) During the period of decline important economic transformations took place within the Ottoman Empire. Central authority was rapidly being replaced by the emergence of a number of small feudal entities which relied on agriculture for their source of wealth. Thus, the Ottoman system of dividing the Empire into administrative units for the purpose of tax collection, iltizam, initiated in the sixteenth century developed into a major challenge to the hegemony of the Ottoman Sultan by the end of the seventeenth century. This political transformation implied
concomitant changes in the economic structure of the Empire. The newly-emerged feudal aristocracy took advantage of the decline of central authority in order to engage in an extensive network of commercial relations with Europe. The main items exported from the Ottoman provinces were agricultural products. By the end of the eighteenth century these commercial networks were so well developed that European merchants considered the Ottoman provinces as their own territory. As İslamoğlu and Keyder point out, the peripheralisation of the Ottoman empire was completed. (İslamoğlu and Keyder, 1977)

It was in the context of the development of commercial relations with Europe that the first signs of a Greek merchant bourgeoisie were observed within the Ottoman Empire. An important characteristic of this Greek commercial bourgeoisie was that although they were located in the agrarian sectors of the Empire, their commercial affairs were located in the urban commercial centres of the Empire and Europe. This was primarily due to the fact that they acted as agents for European commercial enterprises who were unable to reach the agrarian sectors of the Ottoman Empire. As indicated in the introduction, however, this does necessarily imply that all of them were compradors. This is a particularly relevant point with regards to the role and activities of the Greeks in Egypt during the nineteenth century, and it will be discussed at some length in subsequent chapters. Furthermore, this Greek commercial bourgeoisie encouraged the development of two important Greek commercial centres within the confines of the Ottoman Empire. One such centre was located in northern Greece, Epirus, Thessalia and Macedonia, while the other was located on the island of Chios, which was in close proximity to Smyrna, a leading commercial centre with a large Greek population in the Ottoman Empire. (İnalçık, 1969; Svoronos, 1956)
It is important to note that several of the prominent Greeks in the history of the community of Alexandria originated from these two regions.

As the Greek commercial bourgeoisie developed many of the prosperous merchants started to emigrate towards the European centres of commercial activity during the eighteenth century and established their own enterprises. Thus it was not until the eighteenth century that the pattern of establishing Greek merchant communities outside the Ottoman Empire gained momentum. The number of such communities grew "in response to several favourable circumstances that stimulated commerce and maritime activity in the Balkans and the eastern Mediterranean, especially the conditions established by the treaties of Karlowitz (1699), Küçük Kaynarca (1774), and Jassy (1792)". (Frangos, 1973: 91) It was due to this expansion, both in terms of numbers and geographical distribution, of such merchant-based communities that by the end of the eighteenth century "the development of this Greek merchant diaspora had the paradoxical result that the Greeks controlled a commercial empire before they had gained political independence". (Clogg, 1973: 10)

The commercial importance of these communities was emphasised by the fact that "Greek was the lingua franca of Balkan commerce and for this reason Vlachs, Orthodox Albanians, Macedonian Slavs, Bulgarians and Serbs were often indiscriminately lumped together as 'Greeks'" by the Hapsburg authorities. (Clogg, 1973: 11) Nevertheless, the particular role and prominence of the Greek merchants in the diaspora was noted by several European travellers, among whom was Henry Holland:

The active spirit of the Greeks, deprived in great measure of political or national objects, has taken a general direction towards commerce. But, fettered in this respect also, by their condition on the continent of Greece, they emigrate in considerable numbers to adjacent countries, where their activity can have more scope in the nature of the
government...by far the greater part of the exterior trade of Turkey, in the exchange of commodities, is carried on by Greek houses, which have residents at home, and branches in various cities of Europe, mutually aiding each other...Many of the merchants here [Ioanina] have extensive continental connections, which are often family ones likewise. An instance at this time occurs to me of a Greek family, with which I was intimate, where, of four brothers, one was settled at Ioanina, another at Moscow, a third at Constantinople, and the fourth in some part of Germany; all connected together in their concerns. (quoted in Clogg, 1973: 11)

Thus, it is possible to suggest that the spread of the Greek communities in Europe throughout the eighteenth century was an integral part of a wider historical process which witnessed the rapid development of Greek commercial activity and the growth of a substantial Greek merchant class, both within the Ottoman Empire and especially in Europe. (Svoronos, 1956; Kremidas, 1972) The reasons that motivated Greek merchants to emigrate from the Ottoman Empire were diverse among which two may be considered as the most important. First, they sought to take advantage of the rapid expansion and development being experienced by European commerce as part of the transformation towards capitalism. This expansion of European commerce not only increased the profitability of commercial activities, but it also incorporated vast areas of the globe into one commercial network whose centre was European cities. (Wallerstein, 1974) An important part of this global commercial network was the Ottoman Empire which during the eighteenth century was rapidly being transformed into a peripheral economy to the centres (European) of capitalist growth and expansion. (İslamoğlu and Keyder, 1977; Owen, 1981)

The second reason related to the restrictive economic practices prevalent within the Ottoman Empire at a time when European cities were rapidly abolishing most obstacles to commercial activity and the accumulation of wealth. Furthermore, Greek sources indicate that not
only did Ottoman administration and commercial practice stand in the way of the maximisation of commercial profits, but they also "...stress the insecurity of life and property that characterised Ottoman rule during the period of Ottoman decline". (Clogg, 1973: 15) Ioannis Pringos, an early emigrant to Amsterdam, for example, "...was a fervent admirer of the order and commercial freedom that prevailed in the Dutch republic...and he spoke with awed respect of the Amsterdam stock exchange and of the system of commercial companies established in Holland". (Clogg, 1973: 15) He went on to argue that

All these things...cannot be supported under the Turk, nor cannot they come about, for he is without order and justice, and when the capital sermaye amounts to one thousand, he deems it ten times as much, so as to confiscate it, to impoverish the others, not appreciating that the wealth of his subjects is the wealth of his Empire. They (the Dutch) maintain justice but he (the Turk) is wholly unjust and cannot achieve anything but can only destroy. May the Almighty annihilate him, and may Christianity prevail, so that governments may come into being similar to the above, to those in Europe, where every one has his own without fear of injustice, where justice reigns. (quoted in Clogg, 1973: 15)

An important aspect of the historical process of European commercial expansion was the structural transformations experienced by the societies which were being incorporated into the new global commercial network. These transformations were in some respects similar to those which were experienced by European society during the eighteenth century and which saw the rise of a commercial bourgeoisie as the dominant class in several countries. Greek society, even though under Ottoman occupation, experienced similar socio-economic transformations which have, in fact, been considered by many historians as the primary impetus behind the events which led to the start of the Greek Revolution in 1821. As Richard Clogg notes, "...the [Greek] merchants as a class were moved to throw their weight behind the struggle for independence by their increasing impatience with the arbitrariness and uncertainty that
characterised Ottoman rule, and which obviously stood in the way of the maximisation of profits". (Clogg, 1973: 14)

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to present a detailed account of the socio-economic transformations experienced by Greek society during the eighteenth century. It is necessary, however, to indicate, albeit briefly, some of the central characteristics of this socio-economic transformation. Greek historians consider the years between 1798 and 1821 as landmarks in modern Greek history. "...They are turning points in the development of modern Greek life, marking the natural end of certain historical processes while, at the same time, constituting the beginning of further struggles and endeavours." (Koumarianou, 1973: 67)

The year 1798 is when Rigas, a well-known Greek poet who lived in the Danube Principalities, was arrested and his efforts to initiate a movement for the liberation of Greece ended in failure. As for 1821, it marks the start of the Greek Revolution which culminated in the establishment, in a part of Greece, of the first modern Greek state in 1833. Thus, in some respects the arrest of Rigas exemplifies the end of an old social order, which failed in its attempts to liberate Greece, while 1821 signifies the coming to power of a new social order which succeeded in its aims of liberating Greece, albeit in stages.

During the eighteenth century Greek society witnessed the emergence of "...new social forces, which constituted the basis for the creation of the Greek bourgeoisie, [and] acted as an important stimulus in various sectors of Greek life, leading to a substantial diversification of Greek society, and in particular to an astonishing flourishing of culture at the end of eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries". (Koumarianou, 1973: 69) An important aspect of this cultural revival was the part played by Greek merchants, for the majority of the young
scholars who were determined on revitalising Greek cultural life as a precondition for political independence belonged to this rising merchant bourgeoisie. It was a merchant class which was able to accumulate vast wealth throughout the eighteenth century and in particular after the treaty of Küçük Kaynarca in 1774. (Koumarianou, 1973: 76)

Greek merchant capital from the diaspora played a dual role in this Greek cultural and socio-political revival. First, "finance was provided by Greek merchant houses to subsidise new schools, to give scholarships for study in Western universities and to pay for the publication of books". (Koumarianou, 1973: 76) Second, the new merchant bourgeoisie challenged the privileges and status of the old Greek oligarchy, and especially the Phanariotes who had benefited from Ottoman patronage, and thus opened the way for the emergence of new and progressive social and economic movements in Greek society. The Phanariotes, a tightly-knit group, drawn from eleven families residing in the Phanari district of Istanbul, were regarded by most Greeks "...as instruments of Turkish oppression, [and] indifferent to the plight of the Greeks". (Clogg, 1973: 10) Thus, the socio-economic and cultural transformations of the eighteenth century owed much to the prosperity and status achieved by Greek merchants in the diaspora. A similar situation, it will be argued in the following chapters, occurred during the nineteenth century with the Greeks in Egypt providing the impetus for the socio-economic and cultural development of the Greek state.

Thus, it is not surprising to note that it was Greek merchant capital from the diaspora which played a central role in the organisation and initiation of the Greek Revolution in 1821. The revolution was largely the culmination of the efforts of a secret organisation, the Philiki Etairia, which was established in 1814 by three Greek merchants in
Odessa. An examination of the membership list of this organisation indicates that the largest occupational category was Greek merchants in the diaspora, constituting almost fifty-four per cent of the total. The significance of their majority is underscored by the fact that the second largest group were the professional classes who constituted only thirteen per cent of the total, with peasants and artisans together constituting just over one per cent. (Frangos, 1973: 88)

George Frangos proceeds to note that "the Etairia failed to recruit any members in the substantial and older Greek merchant communities of London, Paris, Marseilles and Amsterdam". (Frangos, 1973: 94) Instead, most of the recruited members had been part of the great emigration wave of the second half of the eighteenth century. Unlike the established Greek merchants who were affiliated to the old European social order, these new immigrants made their fortunes along with the development and expansion of capitalism and the new socio-economic forces that it generated.

Thus, it is possible to conclude that the forces which contributed to the emigration of many Greek merchants during the eighteenth century were also the forces which ensured that this new class of Greek merchants in the diaspora would come to transform and eventually achieve prominent status in Greek society. In other words, the origins of the modern Greek state can be traced to the development of European capitalism in the eighteenth century and the concomitant development of particular types of Greek communities in the diaspora. It is within such a historical context, therefore, that this thesis will examine the emigration of Greeks to Egypt, in general, and to Alexandria, in particular.
Greek emigration to Alexandria did not emerge as a significant pattern until the second decade of the nineteenth century. That is not to say that Greeks did not emigrate to Egypt prior to that date. On the contrary, there is adequate material to indicate that there were Greek merchants, mercenaries and craftsmen in such cities as Cairo, Suez, Damietta and Rosetta prior to the arrival of the Napoleonic expedition in 1798. (Kipiadis, 1892; Gialourakis, 1967) Nevertheless, these few Greek merchants had been unable to establish any form of Greek community and in general were almost destitute. When a Greek traveller, Athanasios Ypsilantis, visited Egypt in 1744, he noted that the Greek Orthodox Patriarch, Cosmas III, "...was very poor, and so indebted that he could barely live. The Patriarch's revenue was so small that he could not even afford to pay the interest on his debts, and the Patriarchate property was practically in ruins". [my translation] (Politis, 1929: 80) This was partially due to the fact that not only were the Greeks in Egypt poor, but the size of the Greek population was quite small. In 1800, the new Greek Orthodox Patriarch, Theophilos, lamented the poverty of the Patriarchate and noted that he was responsible for only two hundred families. (Politis, 1929: 97)

In general, the Greek material indicates that most Greeks in Egypt at the time of the Napoleonic expedition were soldiers of fortune and mercenaries. In fact, after Napoleon defeated the Mamluk (Egyptian) armies, he recruited all of the Greek mercenaries and with a command dated the 27th of October, 1798, established three Greek battalions, consisting of one hundred men each, which were to be based in Cairo, Damietta and Rosetta for the sole purpose of providing protection for mail deliveries. (Gialourakis, 1967: 77) Of course, one of the main reasons that prevented the Greeks in Egypt, at that time, from
establishing communities or for that matter amassing personal fortunes was the nature of Ottoman rule in Egypt. Unlike the European cities towards which Greeks emigrated, in Egypt they were by definition second class citizens, not allowed to own property or engage in trade, and strictly under the control of the Ottoman Sultan and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, via the millet system which regulated the affairs of non-Muslims.

Thus, it is not surprising that during the eighteenth century the Greeks in Egypt did not contribute to the development of the Greek commercial bourgeoisie that was taking place in other parts of the Ottoman Empire and Europe. It was only after Muhammad 'Ali achieved power in 1805, and openly defied Ottoman sovereignty and administration in Egypt, that the Greeks were able to start improving their socio-economic status. In fact, as it will be shown below, the era of Muhammad 'Ali, 1805 to 1848, witnessed the first modern substantial wave of Greek emigration to Egypt. In other words, it was only when Muhammad 'Ali was able to initiate an economic transformation, with close similarities to what was happening in other Ottoman provinces, and successfully challenged the political authority of the Ottoman Sultan, that Egypt became an attractive option for the already developed Greek commercial bourgeoisie.

In order to illustrate some of the points discussed above, it is necessary to examine in some detail some aspects of the activities and role of the Greeks in Egypt during the nineteenth century. It was the Greek community in Alexandria, however, which was the first to be established along similar principles to those communities established in Europe during the eighteenth century. Throughout the modern history of the Greeks in Egypt the Alexandria community was the most prominent and
so it will constitute the focus of the rest of this chapter and subsequent chapters. As a means of highlighting, therefore, some of the characteristics of this community, the rest of this chapter will present fourteen life histories of some of the Greek merchants, financiers and industrialists who played a prominent role in both Greek community affairs and/or Egyptian society in general. Furthermore, in an attempt to emphasise the diversity that characterised the Greek community in Alexandria, these life histories will be presented according to the decade of their arrival in Alexandria. This is in addition to the fact that their presentation will be subdivided into three sections which reflect important historical transformations in Egyptian society.
Most historians consider Muhammad 'Ali as the founder of modern Egypt, and the period of his rule as a transition from a subsistence economy, prevailing at the start of the nineteenth century, to an agriculturally-based export-oriented economy by the 1850s. (Issa, 1970: 30-1) In particular, many economic historians agree that Muhammad 'Ali attempted to carry out a programme of rapid industrialization, which relied heavily on revenue from the extensive cultivation and marketing of cotton, but that his efforts were thwarted after the signing of the Treaty of London in 1840 which also ensured the implementation of the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1838. (Issawi, 1961: 23) As Charles Issawi notes,

...with the failure of Muhammad Ali's industrial plans and the abolition of his monopoly system, the first phase of Egypt's modern economic history came to an end. The attempted leap from a subsistence to a complex economy had failed, and instead the country had landed on the road leading to an export-oriented economy. Egypt could now be integrated, as an agricultural unit, in the world wide economic system. (Issawi, 1961: 24)

In general, economic historians point out that most of Egypt's economy experienced rapid growth during the first half of the nineteenth century. This was particularly the case in the agrarian sector, and especially with regard to cotton whose production increased by over four hundred per cent from 1821 to 1835. (O'Brien, 1968: 179) The manufacturing sector followed closely the agrarian sector and especially in the area of cotton textiles. By "...1837 50,000 kantars of yarn per annum were being produced in twenty-nine factories in Upper and Lower Egypt. For ten years or more, Egyptian factories provided the country with the greater part of its requirements of the cheaper kinds of cotton
cloth". (Crouchley, 1938: 69) Finally, commercial activity also experienced rapid development and during the period 1823 to 1838 this sector saw an increase in turnover of almost seventy per cent. (Issawi, 1961: 25)

An important characteristic of this rapid economic growth during this period was the effectiveness of State control over the entire economic life of Egypt. (Issawi, 1961: 22-4); Owen, 1969: 19) Both trade and industry were under the firm control of State monopolies and the majority of the agricultural land was also owned by the State. (Baer, 1966: 81-5) As a result of these State monopolies, government revenue increased dramatically during this period. In 1836, for example, total State profits from the commercial monopolies alone accounted for twenty-five percent of total state revenue. (Crouchley, 1938: 87) Thus, it is not surprising that during this period of rapid economic growth, most foreign merchants in fact left Egypt. The extensive State monopolies, especially in the commercial sector where the State controlled ninety-five percent of all exports and forty percent of all imports, implied that only those few merchants who benefited from State (Muhammad 'Ali) patronage could trade in Egypt. (Crouchley, 1938: 89) Those merchants that did receive State patronage, however, were able to make substantial profits due to the monopoly system. In 1834, for example, raw cotton bought from the State at fifteen dollars per kantar was being sold and re-sold in Alexandria for almost thirty dollars before it even left the port. (Owen, 1969: 39) Similarly, high profits could also be made with respect to other agricultural products where profit margins averaged between two hundred and three hundred percent. ('Abd Allah, 1952: 174-5)

Another important characteristic of this period of rapid economic growth was the re-emergence of Alexandria as an important city and port.
Following its establishment by Alexander the Great, Alexandria developed into an important and populous city during the subsequent centuries. During the Ottoman occupation of Egypt, from the fifteenth century, however, it had declined to an insignificant fishing village with a population of less than eight thousand in 1798. In contrast, the port of Rosetta had a population of about one hundred thousand and at the end of the eighteenth century was the major Egyptian port on the Mediterranean. (Lachanokardis, 1927: 29)

The rebirth of Alexandria may be dated from 1820, when the Mahmudiyya Canal was constructed, thus linking the city with the river Nile and so the rest of Egypt. "The canal provided the city a constant supply of fresh drinking water, made possible the cultivation of agricultural land in the vicinity, and most important of all, it connected Alexandria with the interior of the country through a navigable waterway." [my translation] (Lachanokardis, 1927: 30) The historical significance of Alexandria's revival and the construction of the Mahmudiyya canal is also emphasised by Crouchley, who notes that "it is quite certain that without the Mahmudiyya Canal and the port of Alexandria, the commercial development of Egypt would have been cramped and stifled". (Crouchley, 1938: 79)

Throughout the Muhammad 'Ali era Alexandria continued to expand. By 1849, the value of cotton exported from this port amounted to thirty one percent of total exports. (Crouchley, 1938: 92) Furthermore, Alexandria's population increased from fifteen thousand in 1800 to one hundred and forty-three thousand in 1848, while Cairo experienced a population reduction of just over ten thousand during the same period, from 263,700 to 253,500. (Crouchley, 1938: 52) An important
characteristic of this rapid population increase in Alexandria was the notable increase of foreigners.

At the time of the French invasion, there were probably not a hundred Europeans in Egypt. During the reign of Mohamed Ali, however, there was a large influx of foreigners...After 1820, English, French, Austrian, Tuscan, Swiss, Greek and other business houses were rapidly established. As the sales of agricultural produce for export took place in the government warehouses in Alexandria, most of these foreign merchants established themselves in Alexandria, round the new Mohamed Ali square. (Crouchley, 1938: 52-3)

It is during this period of modern Egyptian history that the first wave of Greek immigrants arrived in Alexandria. In order to highlight some aspects of their background and thus to elaborate on issues related to Egypt's modern socio-economic and political history during this period, six biographies of prominent Greek merchants in Alexandria will be presented below.

1. Count Ioannis d'Anastasy

Count d'Anastasy (né Anastasios) was one of the first Greek merchants to emigrate to Alexandria during this period. He was born in Thesaloníki (Salonika), Northern Greece, sometime between 1780 and 1785, and at an early age emigrated to Malta where he was engaged in overseas trade. In 1805 he was forced to declare bankruptcy, settled twenty-five per cent of his debt and emigrated to Egypt where he associated himself with the commercial activities of Muhammad 'Ali and his son Ibrahim Pasha. This association proved to be quite lucrative because by 1820 he had managed to achieve a social and economic status that permitted him to become the official representative of Sweden in Egypt and to settle the remaining seventy-five per cent of his debts in Malta. It was as Swedish Consul-General that he was awarded the title and thus also changed his name. (Parasyra, 1938: 4-5)
The prominent status achieved by d'Anastasy is confirmed by the fact that most European travellers to Alexandria were his guests. For example, the French Baroness of Minatoli who visited the city in 1820 as his guest devotes a number of pages to d'Anastasy in her book, *Mes Souvenirs d'Egypte*, and praises him as one of the most honest and cultured men in Alexandria. (Minatoli, 1826, Vol. 1: 24) His reputation as an educated person was derived from the fact that he possessed a significant collection of Pharaonic antiquities which were also a source of considerable wealth. One particular sale to the British Museum, which included a complete papyrus written by an Egyptian officer on a military campaign to Syria during the sixth century B.C., brought him substantial financial rewards. (Parasyra, 1938: 13)

In addition to his commercial activities in partnership with Muhammad 'Ali, d'Anastasy also owned a substantial merchant fleet. There are indications in several contemporary accounts that approximately half of the ships that docked in Alexandria were owned by d'Anastasy. (Saint Elme, 1831: 260) Thus, it is not surprising that d'Anastasy would figure prominently as one of the founders of the Greek community in Alexandria. His name appears along with the other prominent Greek merchants whose donations helped establish the first Greek school, hospital and church that were to be used by the community. In fact, practically all accounts of the establishment of the Greek community in Alexandria record the names of four Greek merchants as the founders: Michalis Tossitsas, Nikolaos Stournaras, Stefanos Zizinias and d'Anastasy. (Parasyra, 1938: 8)

Furthermore, d'Anastasy seems to have been a major contributor to the efforts of the *Philiki Etairia* with regard to the Greek Revolution of 1821. In addition to his financial donations, he also used his merchant
fleet to transport men and cargo to Greece after the start of the
revolution in 1821. After the declaration of the first modern Greek
State, d'Anastasy assisted in the liberation of Greek slaves in Egypt by
buying them from their Egyptian owners and sending them back to Greece.
As he had never married, he adopted one of these liberated slaves as his
daughter and she inherited his entire fortune. His adopted daughter
married the French Consul-General in Alexandria, Benedetti, and settled
in France where d'Anastasy also died in 1860. (Parasyra, 1938: 7-8)
Thus, the role of the d'Anastasy family in the affairs of the Greek
community in Alexandria came to an abrupt end.

2. Michalis Tossitsas

The most important Greek merchant to arrive in Alexandria after
d'Anastasy was Michalis Tossitsas. He was born in Metsovon, Epirus,
Northern Greece, in 1787, and received his primary education there. His
father was a wealthy merchant who specialised in furs and in 1797 moved
to Thesaloniki (Salonika) where he established a small workshop for the
processing of furs. By 1801, Michalis Tossitsas had completed his
secondary education in Thesaloniki and then started to work with his
father until 1806. In that year Michalis became head of the family and
administered his father's business along with his three younger
brothers, Theodoros, Konstantinos and Nicolaos.

Michalis Tossitsas seems to have been an extremely capable merchant for
he soon expanded his operations and established branches in Kavalla,
Northern Greece, Malta and Livourne. It was in Kavalla that he met
Muhammad 'Ali and the two cooperated in a number of commercial
enterprises. Nevertheless, the Tossitsas commercial business stagnated
in the depression that followed the end of the war in 1814 and in 1818
Michalis sent his three younger brothers and his sister, Stamatia, to Egypt. During the following two years Michalis abandoned all other commercial activities and concentrated on trade with Egypt. In 1820, his sister wrote to say that Muhammad 'Ali was well established in Egypt, both as governor and prosperous merchant, and that he should also come to Egypt. Michalis immediately wound up his business affairs and arrived in Alexandria in July, 1820, where he was met personally by Muhammad 'Ali.

The first position to which Michalis Tossitsas was appointed by Muhammad 'Ali was that of overseer and manager of the royal estates which represented a substantial part of the most fertile land in Egypt. Furthermore, Tossitsas was also responsible in advising Muhammad 'Ali in the manner in which agricultural products from the State warehouses in Alexandria, would be sold to the various European merchants. These two positions, at that point in Egypt's modern economic history, together with his friendship with the Governor ensured that Tossitsas soon became one of the most important and wealthy foreign merchants in Alexandria.

It is not surprising that Michalis Tossitsas was appointed as the first Greek Consul-General in Egypt in 1833, and elected as the first President of the Greek Community in Alexandria in 1843. Thus, all Greek archival material and publications from Alexandria consider Michalis Tossitsas as the founder of the modern Greek community in Egypt, in general, and that of Alexandria, in particular. In addition to his contributions towards the establishment of the Greek community, Tossitsas was also one of its principle benefactors. In the period between 1847 and 1854, when he had to return to Greece, he donated four and a half thousand Egyptian pounds and and fifty-seven and a half thousand square metres of land for the establishment of various
community institutions. This was in addition to his various other activities, of which his role in separating the community from the control of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate was the most important and will be discussed below in chapter five.

In his capacity as the first Greek Consul-General, Michalis Tossitsas was also instrumental in establishing a pattern of relations between Egypt and Greece, both at the level of state relations and between the Greek community in Alexandria and their homeland. In 1850, Tossitsas tried to establish a school in his native Metsovon, but the Ottoman authorities prevented the project from being carried out. Thus, Tossitsas deposited over one hundred thousand drachmas in the Bank of Greece so that a school could be built after Metsovon was liberated. He also established a new school in Thessaloniki, and made significant financial contributions to Athens University and towards female education in Athens. Tossitsas died in Athens in 1856, but the institutional, socio-economic and cultural structures that he had helped establish for the Greek community in Alexandria and the rest of Egypt were developed and remained until the 1960s.

3. Stefanos Zizinias

Stefanos Zizinias can be considered as one of Michalis Tossitsas' descendants as his mother was one of his elder sisters who had married and settled in the island of Chios. Zizinias was born in 1805 in Chios and emigrated to Alexandria following the massacre of Greeks, among whom was his father, by Ottoman troops at the start of the Greek Revolution in 1821. Upon arrival in Alexandria, the Zizinias family, Stefanos, his mother and four younger brothers, was assisted and protected by Michalis Tossitsas. Zizinias established a commercial firm, specialising in the
export of Egyptian products to the European markets, and sent his four brothers to various European cities as his agents. The bulk of his trade was directed towards France and as his Ottoman citizenship was a hindrance to his commercial activities, he applied for and received French citizenship as well as a decoration from the French government. By 1840, the Zizinias merchant firm was one of the leading firms in Alexandria and Stefanos Zizinias had achieved an important economic and social status in the city. In that year he was awarded the title of Count by the monarch of Belgium and was appointed Belgian Consul-General in Alexandria. When his uncle, Michalis Tossitsas, had to return to Greece in 1854, as a result of the Crimean war, he was elected President of the Greek community in Alexandria.

The Crimean war strained relations between Greece, the Greeks in Egypt and 'Abbas Hilmi, son of Muhammad 'Ali and Governor of Egypt. 'Abbas Hilmi, unable to sustain his father's independent position, was forced to ally himself with the Ottoman Sultan and take measures against the Greeks and Greece who had allied with Russia in the Crimean conflict. Nevertheless, 'Abbas Hilmi was not able to restrict the activities of those merchants who came under the protection of the powerful European nations such as Britain and France. Thus, Zizinias with his French citizenship and his position as Belgian Consul-General proved invaluable in his efforts to protect the Greek community of Alexandria at this critical moment and so ensure the continuity of the pioneering work of Michalis Tossitsas. Due to pressure from the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate, however, he was forced to resign from his position as President of the community in 1857.

In addition to his commercial interests, Stefanos Zizinias was also a large landowner who owned both agricultural land and urban real estate.
Most of this property, and especially his urban real estate in Alexandria, had been given to him by Muhammad 'Ali in return for services rendered to the Egyptian navy. His urban real estate which stretched for fifteen kilometres east of Alexandria along the coast, from Ramleh to San Stefano in contemporary Alexandria, made him the largest landowner in Alexandria. In fact, the Greek community archives note that between them, Zizinias and Tossitsas, then owned three quarters of Alexandria and its environs. Furthermore, Zizinias owned large estates of agricultural land on either side of the Mahmudiyya canal in close proximity to Alexandria.

Stefanos Zizinias was also a pioneer in the field of cultural life. He established the first theatre in Alexandria, named Zizinia, which for several years was the focus of all European cultural events in the city and in Egypt as well. This cultural tradition was continued by his son, Menandros, who had been educated in France and married the daughter of a French General named Aper. As for his daughter, Ekaterini, she married into a wealthy Greek family from Istanbul and went to live in Vienna. Thus, Menandros became the sole inheritor after Stefanos Zizinias died in 1870. The vast Zizinias fortune, however, did not last for long. The bombardment of Alexandria by the British fleet in 1882 destroyed much of their property, including the palatial residence on Muhammad 'Ali Square which was reputed to have a library containing sixty thousand volumes and many valuable works of art. As Menandros Zizinias refused to sign the telegram sent by several prominent members of the Greek community of Alexandria congratulating Gladstone after the events of 1882, he did not receive any compensation from the British. This spelled the end of the Zizinias economic and social prominence in Alexandria and Menandros was left with his father's title and the
Zizinia theatre which he was also forced to sell to the Anglo-Egyptian Bank at the end of the century. Menandros' son, Stefanos, studied law and during the 1920s and 1930s had to practice this profession in order to sustain a living. Thus, the Zizinias fortune and family prominence came to an abrupt end.

4. Petros Cavafy

The fortunes of Petros Cavafy, father of the well-known Greek poet, Konstantinos Cavafy, and his family constitute another example of a prominent Greek family in Alexandria which failed to sustain its wealth and status into the twentieth century. Petros Cavafy was born to a prosperous merchant family in Istanbul in 1814 and died poor in Alexandria in 1870. His father, Ioannis, was in the cloth trade with a Greek partner, Ioannis Ionidis, who resided in Manchester. Ionidis would send Ioannis cloth and the latter would sell it throughout the Ottoman Empire. Following the death of Ioannis, his two sons, George, who had already emigrated and settled in Manchester in 1826, and Petros, took over the family business, Cavafy and Co. It should also be noted that both Petros and George held British citizenship which gave them the needed protection for their commercial activities in the Ottoman Empire.

The first record of the Cavafy family presence in Alexandria is the signature of Petros Cavafy on a document dated the 30th of May, 1844, by which the Greek community in Alexandria had decided to establish its own church independently of the jurisdiction of the Greek Orthodox Patriarch in Egypt. It is important to note that in this document Petros Cavafy appears as a Greek citizen. This did not affect his economic activities as the previous efforts of Michalis Tossitsas and the policy of Muhammad 'Ali meant that as a Greek citizen in Egypt he was able to take
advantage of the Capitulations which favoured and protected foreign merchants. This is in addition to the fact that as a Greek citizen he could also receive the protection and support of Tossitsas who, as noted above, was clearly a most influential person in Egyptian economic affairs at the time. Nevertheless, Petros seems to have also kept his British citizenship which he needed because until 1850 he commuted between Alexandria and Istanbul. In that year he liquidated his affairs in Istanbul and settled permanently in Alexandria. This period also coincided with the events leading to the Crimean war and may have thus encouraged him to settle permanently in Alexandria and abandon Istanbul. From Alexandria, Petros sent his brother George in Manchester Egyptian cereals and in return received British cloth.

Subsequent to the departure of Michalis Tossitsas for Greece in 1854, and because of the troubled times in Egypt due to the Crimean war, Petros Cavafy appeared once more in Alexandria as a British citizen. This enabled him to be elected Vice-President of the Greek community in Alexandria so that along with Stefanos Zizinias, the President, the community came under the protection of Britain, France and Belgium. Russia, of course, had also stopped exporting cereals to Britain at that time and Cavafy, as a British subject, took advantage of the situation to expand his cereal exports to Britain where cereal prices had increased sharply.

By the early 1860s, the Cavafy merchant firm was among the top ten foreign firms in Alexandria. Petros had already added cotton to his exports to Britain by 1860 by establishing in that year his first cotton-gin in Kafr al-Zayyat, a village in the Egyptian Delta. Thus, he was able to take full advantage of the Cotton Boom in Egypt, caused by the effects of the cessation of cotton exports from America to Britain.
due to the Civil War. In 1863, Petros Cavafy had already established branches of his merchant firm in eight different locations: Alexandria, Kafr al-Zayyat, Cairo and Minya in Egypt and London, Liverpool, Manchester and Marseilles in Europe. Furthermore, it was in that same year, on the 29th of April, that his son Konstantinos was born. Eventually, Konstantinos' fame as a modern Greek poet was all that was to be left of the Cavafy economic and social status in Alexandria.

The decline of the Cavafy economic and social status occurred soon after the death of Petros in 1870. His wife Chariklia emigrated to Manchester in 1872 and the Cavafy merchant firm was dissolved in 1877. It is not until 1880 that Konstantinos Cavafy returned to Alexandria where he was employed at the Ministry of Irrigation in order to support himself. In all this the Cavafy family exemplified a trend that was common to most of the prominent Greek families that contributed to the establishment of the Greek community in Alexandria. All the leading Greek merchant families in Alexandria, including those discussed above, who arrived during this period and may be considered as the founding fathers of the community, were unable to sustain their economic and social position after the late 1870s and especially after the British military occupation of Egypt in 1882. In distinct contrast to these families, who achieved wealth almost immediately upon arrival in Alexandria, but which lasted for only one generation, there were a number of Greek merchants who emigrated to Egypt during this period but did not achieve a prominent economic and social status until a much later period. Nevertheless, these families were able to sustain their position for several generations and examples of this pattern of Greek emigration to Egypt are given below.
5. Konstantinos Sinadinos

The first member of this family to emigrate to Alexandria was Konstantinos, who left the island of Chios immediately after the massacre of 1821 and went to Trieste. In 1830, he came and settled in Alexandria with his two sons, Avghoustinos and Ioannis, and it was Ioannis and his descendants who achieved prominence in later years. Avghoustinos Sinadinos engaged in the cotton trade and was able to achieve a sufficient degree of economic and social respectability so that one of his sons, Themistoklis, could later marry, Eliza Rallis, the daughter of a very wealthy Greek merchant in Alexandria. Themistoklis and Eliza had three daughters and one son, Avghoustinos, who became a director of the Choremi-Benaki cotton-exporting firm, one of the largest in Alexandria. By virtue of his position in the Choremi-Benaki firm, Avghoustinos was also elected to the Alexandria city council, Vice-President of the Greek Chamber of Commerce, President of the Alexandria Exporter's Association and a member of the board in several Anglo-Egyptian firms.

It was Ioannis Sinadinos and his branch of the Sinadinos family, however, who was to achieve an important economic and social position. Unlike other prominent Greeks discussed above, Ioannis did not involve himself in trade, but focussed his activities in the areas of finance and banking. Along with the French Pastré brothers and Hambro of London, he established in 1864 the first private, commercial bank in Egypt, the Anglo-Egyptian Bank, which played an important role in the economic history of Egypt and will be discussed below in chapter four. Ioannis also established a second commercial bank with the participation of two other Greek financiers, Zervoudachis and Salvagos, and a merchant
firm with Rallis. He had eight children four of which were males, Konstantinos, Amvrousios, Mikes and Nikolaos.

Amvrousios became the representative of the Rothschilds in Cairo and a close friend of Khedive Tawfiq, monarch of Egypt (1879-1892), and Lord Cromer. Konstantinos and Mikes established the Société Commercial d'Égypte, which was one of the leading merchant-finance firms in Alexandria and will be discussed below in chapter four.

Although most members of the Sinadinos family achieved different degrees of status in Egyptian society during the nineteenth century, it was only Mikes Sinadinos who also achieved a social status within the Greek community in Alexandria. He was elected President of the community in 1911 and remained in that position until his death in 1919. Thus, although the Sinadinos family could be considered as an important Greek family in terms of their economic, social and even political role in modern Egyptian history, their impact or role in the affairs of the Greek community in Alexandria only achieved significance in the early part of the twentieth century. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Greek archives and publications in Alexandria, which cover the nineteenth century, record only brief references to their activities.

6. Konstantinos Zervoudachis

The first to emigrate to Egypt was Konstantinos Zervoudachis. He was born in Chios in 1822, and in 1835 both his parents died. In that year he left for Alexandria where he sought the assistance and protection of a relative, Scaramanga, who was a prosperous merchant in the city. With Scaramanga's assistance he received an education in Alexandria and embarked in commerce with his brother Nikolaos. Their efforts proved futile and in 1838, Konstantinos joined the merchant firm of Stavros
Proios in Alexandria. He worked for this firm until 1846, when Proios returned to Greece. Konstantinos Zervoudachis continued running the Proios firm, but without much success. In 1854, however, he married the sole heir of Pantelis Mavrocordatos from Istanbul. Mavrocordatos was a wealthy and prominent Greek merchant family in Istanbul which produced many of Greece's political figures. The marriage to Ekaterini Mavrocordatos proved profitable in financial and social terms. In 1856, Konstantinos Zervoudachis established his own firm in Kafr al-Zayyat, a village in the Egyptian Delta, and embarked in the cotton trade. The timing was most appropriate as it preceded the cotton boom period.

By the end of the 1870s Konstantinos Zervoudachis had emerged as an important cotton exporter in Alexandria, but he had not been able to achieve social status among the Greek community in that city. Failing to break into the closely knit social group of prominent Greeks in Alexandria, he associated primarily with other Greek newcomers to Alexandria, although he himself had arrived in 1835. His association with such families as Salvagos and Benakis, discussed below, brought him close to British economic interests in Egypt. This association with British merchant and finance capital was rewarded with a knighthood from Queen Victoria in 1882 and the wrath of the anti-British Greek press in Alexandria. It was as Sir Konstantinos Zervoudachis that he signed the telegram congratulating Gladstone in 1882 for occupying Egypt.

With the arrival of British control over the affairs of Egypt after 1882, Sir Konstantinos Zervoudachis improved his economic and social status and eventually succeeded in being elected Vice-President of the Greek community in Alexandria in 1885. His newly-acquired social status was confirmed by the fact that Khedive Tawfiq, Lord Cromer and Sir Elwin Palmer sent messages of condolences when he died on the 17th of January,
1895. Following his death, his widow retired to Paris where she died in July, 1922 and they were succeeded by four sons, George, Amvrose, Nikolaos and Emmanuil, and one daughter. The daughter married Kleon Ragavis, a Greek who was chief engineer in the Egyptian Railroads, a British owned and run company.

It was George, eldest son of Konstantinos Zervoudachis, who continued the family business and position in society. George Zervoudachis was born in Alexandria, but studied in Marseilles. When he returned to Egypt after the events of 1882, he became General Director of his father's firm, Zervoudachis and Sons: General Merchants and Bankers. He developed the banking side of the firm so that at the turn of century it was purely a financial enterprise. George Zervoudachis was a member of the board in a number of commercial banks and real estate firms, such as the Bank of Egypt, Credit Union Foncière, the Alexandria Water Company, the Alexandria Tramway Company, etc. He also participated in a joint venture with British capital in metal exploration in Ethiopia. With regard to the Greek community in Alexandria, his only contribution was fifteen thousand Egyptian pounds towards the establishment of a Greek school in Chatby on the 23rd. of April, 1907. The school was, of course, named after his father Konstantinos Zervoudachis and was constructed in what was then considered to be the new suburb of Alexandria where the prosperous foreign merchants and financiers lived. It should be noted that the majority of the other prominent Greek families still lived in Ramleh, the old elite suburb of Alexandria.

The 1907 financial crisis in Egypt, however, caused the family firm to go bankrupt. The firm was unable to regain its status and eventually one of the brothers, Amvrose, committed suicide on the 10th of October, 1911, while George died as a pauper on the 28th of August, 1912. The
only brother to survive the crisis was Emmanuil who had inherited the wealth of his rich father-in-law, Dranet Pasha. Emmanuil's only survivor, a daughter, later inherited her grandfather's fortune and married an unknown and poor Cretan lawyer named Eleftherios Venizelos. Venizelos eventually became one of the most important Prime Ministers in twentieth century Greece, maintained a staunch, anti-royalist and pro-British position and thus founded the first Greek bourgeois political party with mass-based support.
II. Merchants and Bankers: 1849 - 1860

Muhammad 'Ali died in 1849, and during the next decade his economic policies were completely overturned. It was during this period that Egypt's integration into the world economic system was both accelerated and structured in such a way so as to generate the pre-conditions for her dependence. (Radwan, 1974: 231-47) The processes by which Egypt's economy "...became almost totally dependent on activities related to the financing, trading, transport, and industrial processing of the cotton crop" (Radwan, 1974: 233) were initiated during the 1850s; an historical development, however, which necessitated several structural changes of which the most important may be indicated briefly below.

The most important of these changes was the abolition of the State monopoly system initiated by Muhammad 'Ali. This change, which had been forced upon Muhammad 'Ali in the late 1840s, was continued by his successor, Abbas Hilmi (1849 - 1854), and completed by Sa'id Pasha (1854 - 1863). (Owen, 1969: 68) Sa'id, in particular, carried out a "...series of liberal reforms, the foremost of which was the suppression of internal customs duties and all monopolies...Sa'id's weakness, [however], proved to be especially deleterious to the welfare of Egypt by giving much scope to the interference of the foreign consuls". (Mustafa, 1968: 305) European commercial houses, therefore, supported by their respective Consuls, began sending their agents into the villages where they were faced, however, with severe competition from the already established Greek merchants. (Owen, 1969: 69)

A second important change was that restrictions on private ownership of land were gradually removed. As Issawi notes,
By 1858 collective responsibility for land taxes had been abolished; the right of inheritance by both males and females had been fully affirmed and so had the right to sell or mortgage land; finally, foreigners were authorized to acquire any kind of land. This last provision was of particular importance, since it enabled foreign capital to enter Egyptian agriculture by means of mortgage and other loans. (Issawi, 1961: 25)

Nevertheless, the amount of capital invested in land by foreigners at that time was quite small. Grain, still the primary commercial crop, required little capital, and there was yet to develop a land market as such. (Owen, 1969: 71)

Along with these structural changes several infrastructural aspects of the Egyptian economy also witnessed rapid improvement during this period. The transportation system, for example, was greatly extended and improved and by 1858, Cairo was linked by railway with both Alexandria and Suez. Such infrastructural changes encouraged even further the arrival of foreign merchants into Egypt's hinterland and thus accelerated Egypt's integration as an agricultural unit into the European commercial system and the international division of labour.

An important result of these transformations was that Egypt's commercial sector experienced both a sharp increase in value as well as a structural change in its pattern. Between 1849 and 1850, for example, the value of trade increased by fifty per cent. Similarly, the pattern of trade altered so that Britain emerged during the 1850s as Egypt's principal trading partner. Whereas England had only taken between twelve and twenty per cent of Egyptian exports in the 1840s, during the 1850s England took roughly half of Egypt's total exports, which also included half of its cotton and cereal crops. (Owen, 1969: 81)
Another important consequence of these changes was the introduction for the first time of foreign capital which contributed to the establishment of a number of private commercial banks, many of which had drawing rights in the Paris and London money-markets. (Owen, 1969: 83) It should be noted at this point, however, that an additional factor which encouraged the flow of foreign capital into Egypt was the legal changes that had taken place in Britain in 1844. These changes allowed for Joint Stock Companies to be established legally without the necessity of receiving a royal charter or being approved by an act of Parliament. Furthermore, the Act of 1855 permitted these Joint Stock Companies to exercise Limited Liability and to conduct business without having to raise the full capital named in the shares. Thus, the liberalisation of the commercial structures within which capital could operate also constituted an important factor in encouraging such companies to embark on overseas ventures. (Issa, 1970: 35)

Within a year of the changes indicated above, the Egyptian Khedive authorised a Greek financier, Paschalis, to establish the first Joint Stock Company with Limited Liability in Egypt. The Bank of Egypt was established in 1856 according to British law and relied heavily on Paschalis' contacts in the London money-market. The capital for the establishment of the Bank of Egypt was raised exclusively in London and gained the support of such financial giants as the East India Company, the London and Westminster Bank, and the Oriental Banking Corporation. (Issa, 1970: 37; Owen, 1969: 83) Of particular importance is that Paschalis also received full support for his activities from the British Treasury which noted that it was

\[...\text{desirable to encourage the investment of British capital in an undertaking which is founded for the purpose of extending to a country with which the mercantile community of this country}\]
A third aspect of this process of rapid change was the expansion and Europeanisation of the city of Alexandria; by 1857, Europeans were arriving at the rate of thirty thousand per year in Egypt and most of them settled in Alexandria. This massive influx of Europeans generated a construction boom which eventually also transformed the physical appearance of Alexandria. In 1856, the correspondent of The Times noted that

A traveller returning to the town after the absence of a few years would find an extraordinary improvement in the appearance of the town and the condition of the people. Three handsome churches for the Christian worship have been erected. Bells are heard to toll calling the Christians to divine worship. A railway has been completed to Cairo and new streets are springing up. (quoted in Owen, 1969: 85)

Finally, another important part of these changes was the ever-increasing privileges which European merchants and financiers were able to extort from the Egyptian authorities. These privileges were extracted by the Europeans through a manipulation of the contradictory situation in which the politically weakened Egyptian State found itself. On the one hand, it was concerned to limit further European encroachments while on the other, it was also attempting to prevent Egypt's re-incorporation into the Ottoman Empire, of which it was formally still a part. Thus, in order to receive support for the latter, the Egyptian State was compelled to neglect the former and grant an ever increasing number of concessions to the European Consuls who were based in Alexandria. Furthermore, inter-European commercial rivalry and the dramatic growth of the European merchants and financiers encouraged the Consuls to seek even greater privileges and concessions from the Egyptian State. This
situation brought about major changes in the Egyptian juridical structure, the most important of which were in two particular areas.

One was in the ability of foreigners to impose their own commercial methods on the Egyptian Government and people...Secondly, in commercial as in criminal matters, foreigners managed to become less and less subject to Egyptian jurisdiction. The word 'domicile', used in the Capitulations to signify the place which was immune from entry by the local police without the presence of a consular representative, was extended to include any property belonging to a foreigner, with the result that European storehouses and factories were largely outside Egyptian control. (Owen, 1969: 87)

According to European sources, the impunity with which European Consuls behaved was particularly noticeable among the un-paid and honorary Consuls who were not even natives of the countries they represented. These honorary Consuls, who were also wealthy merchants or financiers, were primarily concerned to maximise their own profits. (Mustafa, 1968: 305-6) The British Consul-General in Alexandria, for example, was alarmed at the activities of these honorary Consuls and saw them as a potential threat to British interests in Egypt when he noted in a dispatch that

The language of these gentlemen on general questions accords rather with what is beneficial to their own interests, than with the policy of the governments they represent. When Said Pacha first came into power and was discussing the expediency of putting an end to the system of monopolizing produce in the hands of the government, which Abbas Pacha had lately attempted to re-establish, one of the chief opponents of his liberal [sic] views was the Belgian Consul-General. The language he held was certainly not in accordance with the policy of the Belgian government in such matters. (quoted in Mustafa, 1968: 306)

It is probably correct that the Belgian Consul-General's attitude with regard to the issue of State monopolies did not accord with the policy of the Belgian government. Belgium, as Britain, was a capitalist State concerned to extend her commercial empire and thus would favour liberal economic policies in Egypt. The Belgian Consul-General, however, was
Stefanos Zizinias, President of the Greek Community in Alexandria at the time, and a prosperous merchant who relied heavily on the personal contacts between the Greeks and the Egyptian State that had been initiated by Michalis Tossitsas. Thus, for Zizinias, the abolition of State monopolies threatened not only his own commercial privileges, but also those of the many other Greek merchants who benefited from these well-established personal contacts between the Greeks and Muhammad 'Ali and his family. What the British Consul-General was expressing was one aspect of the emerging contradictions between European capital, seeking to expand, and the mercantile privileges held by the Greek community in Alexandria.

It is of some interest to note that other observers of the period reproached the British Consul-General himself, Sir Murray, for exploiting his relationship with the Egyptian Khedive for personal gain. Thus, Sidi Lokman al-Hakim, a contemporary Egyptian, noted that Sir Murray led Khedive 'Abbas to believe that he could count on British support and in return the Khedive was not ungrateful. "He made Sir Murray quite wealthy, who in turn, without involving his government knew very well how to serve British interests while not neglecting his own." (al-Hakim, 1873: 7) What is certain is that the result of this close relationship between Sir Murray and the Egyptian Khedive was detrimental for the Greek merchants. The Egyptian Khedive seems to have listened to Sir Murray, and:

Finding out that the Greeks were the principal purchasers of produce in the interior of Egypt, 'Abbas intended to expel them altogether from the country. That act was duly effected with great and unnecessary severity by the governor of Alexandria; and so little disposition was shown to attend to the representations of the consuls of the allied powers, when they asked for the prolongation of the term in favour of Greeks whose large dealings with commercial houses would have entailed
heavy losses, that foreign protection was largely accorded them. (Mustafa, 1968: 303)

Once more it is clear that having Zizinias and Cavafy, respectively with French and British citizenship, as President and Vice-President of the Greek community was quite important at that moment of crisis. For several historical sources indicate that European capital had an ambivalent and contradictory attitude towards the Greek merchants in Alexandria and Egypt in general. (Owen, 1969) On the one hand, it sought their cooperation because they were well-established in the Egyptian villages while on the other hand, "the enterprise of the Greek traders, combined with their knowledge of the language and the habits of the Turks, made them formidable competitors". (Mustafa, 1968: 303)

Thus, it is not surprising to find Sir Murray encouraging Khedive 'Abbas to deport the Greek merchants and questioning the ethics of Zizinias' advice to Khedive Sa'id while the British ambassador at Istanbul was coming to the rescue of the Greek merchants. The Istanbul-based British ambassador accomplished this by issuing a circular stating that "Hellenic subjects in the service of British commercial houses, or of British subjects in general, are to be allowed to remain for the present on the responsibility of their several employees". (quoted in Mustafa, 1968: 303) Of course, such support from the Istanbul-based British ambassador, at that moment, did not completely remove the threat of expulsion for most Greek merchants. As more European merchants confronted the competition from the well-established Greek merchants, their complaints to their respective governmental authorities increased.

Thus, by 1861, a correspondent of the Manchester Cotton Supply Association was complaining that it was very rare for an Alexandria merchant, [British or French], to buy direct from a peasant, as the latter was usually in debt to some middleman, [Greek merchant/usurer], who had first call on his crops. (Owen, 1969: 70)
It was in this social and economic context that the second wave of Greek emigration to Alexandria occurred. In order to highlight some of the characteristics of this second emigration wave and to elaborate on some of the points made above, two case studies will be presented below.

1. Theodoros Rallis

The first member of this family to arrive in Alexandria was Theodoros Rallis, who was born in Aidinio, Asia Minor, on the 2nd of November, 1824. He received his education in Smyrna, and arrived in Egypt with his three brothers in the early 1850s. All four brothers settled in a village named Talha, near Mansura in the Delta, and were engaged in the cotton trade. Of the four brothers, however, it was Theodoros who was to achieve economic and social status among the Greek community in Alexandria. The importance of Theodoros Rallis, for Egyptian economic history, is that he was the first to introduce mechanical, steam-powered, cotton gins into the Egyptian village.

Rallis initially purchased twenty second-hand cotton gins from a British firm, Platt Brothers, with whom his brother Antonis was employed, and who had used them to process American cotton in England. When the cotton gins arrived in Talha, Theodoros Rallis had to adapt them in order to process Egyptian cotton which was long staple. Rallis also imported a cotton press and so was able to send to his customers in Alexandria cotton that had already been ginned and pressed into bales ready for shipping. This was an important technological innovation because it not only meant that more cotton could be packed in a single cargo ship, but also the Lancashire textile mills did not have to engage in the tiresome business of ginning the cotton. Of course, with the
advent of the American Civil War and the expanded demand for Egyptian cotton this technological innovation was to prove invaluable.

A subsidiary benefit from the introduction of the cotton gins was that the cotton seeds were now available in Egyptian villages for the initiation of other manufacturing enterprises. Initially the cotton seeds were used as fuel, but soon other Greek entrepreneurs started to extract the oil and then manufacture various products such as soap, edible oils, etc. It is reasonable, therefore, to suggest that Theodoros Rallis played a central role in the development of modern manufacturing in Egypt. Of course, he benefited considerably from his contributions to Egyptian development and by 1858, he had become one of the wealthiest merchants in Alexandria where he had settled permanently. During the period of the cotton boom he was able to increase his personal fortune and by 1871 he was elected President of the Greek community in Alexandria. He occupied this position until 1885, when he was forced to resign due to his anti-British attitude, but he had seen the community through a particularly critical period in its history. Not only was this the period during which Egypt was declared bankrupt, and Britain intervened militarily in order to suppress the 'Urabi revolution, but this was also a difficult period in the relationship between the Greek community, on the one hand, and the Greek Patriarchate and the Greek Consulate in Alexandria on the other hand. That Theodoros Rallis was able to carry the community through such a troublesome time is also evidence of his political skills.

Theodoros Rallis attempted to continue the traditions of Michalis Tossitsas, Zizinias, etc., and was quite concerned with the ethnic dimension of the Greek community. As President of the community he abolished all school fees in order to ensure that Greek children went to
Greek schools and not to any of the other foreign community schools that had been established in the 1860s. Furthermore, and as a means of enhancing the mercantile abilities of the Greek community, he introduced business studies and three foreign languages, Arabic, English, and French, as compulsory subjects. Nevertheless, his economic interests were almost entirely connected with British capitalism. It was in Britain that his brother Antonis had established the family firm, Rallis Brothers Company, more out of a pragmatic approach to the changes being experienced by the Egyptian economy, rather than an expression of an alliance with British capital. The Rallis fortune, however, was destined to be incorporated into British capitalism. Theodoros did not have a male heir and his only daughter, Maria, married her first cousin, Amvrosios, son of Antonis Rallis.

Amvrosios Rallis was born in London in 1850, and graduated from King's College, University of London, in 1871. After his graduation he came to Alexandria where he married his cousin and worked for his father-in-law. When the latter died, on the 22nd of November, 1890, Amvrosios inherited the whole family estate. Amvrosios was one hundred per cent British and chose the post of Vice-President of the Alexandria City Council, which was Lord Cromer's brainchild, rather than seeking to be elected on the Greek community council. He remained Vice-President from 1896 to 1906, and was also elected President of the Alexandria Exporters Association for the period 1896 to 1907. This association, which was also British controlled, dominated all commercial transactions in the city during this period. Amvrosios also became a member of the British Chamber of Commerce in Alexandria, rather than the Greek Chamber of Commerce which was established in 1901, and in that same year he dissolved the Rallis Brothers Company in order to take up a directorship at the Egyptian
National Bank which was a British institution. Thus, the economic interests of a major Greek merchant family in Alexandria were entirely incorporated into the expanding British interests in Egypt, reflecting a more general process which was gaining momentum throughout Egypt.

2. Ioannis Choremis

Ioannis Choremis was born in Chios from which he emigrated to Britain after the events of 1821. He first sought employment with another Greek merchant firm, Frangiadis in Liverpool, and then worked in a shipping company. In 1849, he entered commerce and finance on his own account and greatly benefited from the economic upheavals caused by the Crimean War. He subsequently entered into partnership with an Englishman, Mellor, and they concentrated on financing various commercial activities between Britain and Egypt. In 1857, he emigrated to Alexandria to represent the Choremis-Mellor company and established a new cotton-exporting firm with an additional partner, Davis. This new firm, Choremis-Mellor-Davis & Co., was soon to become one of the leading cotton-exporting firms in Alexandria, but Choremis was primarily interested in finance capital and devoted his energies to the establishment of the Alexandria Stock Exchange.

As the situation deteriorated during the period 1875 to 1882, his British partners left the firm and returned to Liverpool. In 1876, therefore, Choremis went into partnership with another Greek financier, Benakis, who had recently arrived in Alexandria from Manchester. The new firm, Choremis-Benakis & Co., survived these turbulent years and by the end of the century was the number one cotton-exporting firm in Egypt. Nevertheless, although Ioannis Choremis was one of the wealthiest Greeks in Alexandria his contribution to and role in Greek
community affairs was insignificant. The only donations he made were the establishment of two schools and a church in his birth-place, Chios. When he died in 1897, his son Konstantinos inherited the entire estate.

Konstantinos Choremis was born in Liverpool on the 21st of December, 1864, where he also received his education and British citizenship. Prior to joining his father he attended the school of Higher Commercial Studies in Marseilles and on arrival in Alexandria was appointed as a co-director of the firm of Choremis-Benakis & Co. Having inherited his father's estate, he immediately became one of the wealthiest persons in Alexandria and was thus elected President of the Alexandria General Produce Association for the period 1913 to 1930. He was also a prominent member of the board of the Egyptian Joint Cotton Company, which was the largest firm that financed cotton production and export in Egypt. His most important position, however, was that of President of the Minat al-Basal (Cotton Exchange). This he held for a period of fifteen years. Nevertheless, following the example of his father, he played no role in the affairs of the Greek community of Alexandria. Although ethnically Greek, Konstantinos Choremis and his father were in fact British representatives of British interests in Egypt.
This period of Egyptian socio-economic and political history is characterised by two events which were to affect drastically its future development: first, the cotton boom which lasted from 1861 to 1865, and brought vast profits to all those who were associated with the production and distribution of this crop; second, the period 1876 to 1882, during which Egypt was declared bankrupt. The *Caisse de la Dette Publique* and the Mixed Courts were established in 1876, formally undermining Egyptian sovereignty and extending European control over her economic and juridical affairs. This was followed shortly by the British military occupation in 1882. In other words, these two decades are characterised by the historical paradox that in the 1860s Egypt was in a favourable situation to embark on a path of general prosperity due to the cotton boom while a decade later she was declared bankrupt and soon thereafter occupied by Britain.

The extended cultivation of cotton was by far the most central factor during this historical period of modern Egyptian history. As Roger Owen points out:

*The years 1861 to 1866 mark an important turning-point in the history of Egyptian cotton production. When the period began some half a million cantars were being grown on perhaps 250,000 feddans of land; five years later the harvest had increased four times in size, the area by five, and from then on cotton became once and for all the crop which absorbed the major portion of Egyptian energies and produced an overwhelming share of its export earnings. The cause of this sudden metamorphosis was the American Civil War, which, by depriving the European textile industry of the greater part of the supplies of American cotton on which it was largely dependent, drove up the price of cotton to enormous heights and conferred great prosperity on those countries which, like Egypt, were able to take advantage of the favourable situation.* (Owen, 1969: 89)
This rapid increase in the cultivation and export of cotton naturally generated an equally large increase in export earnings. Egyptian cotton was able to increase its share of the British market from three to twelve per cent and its earnings during the same period from one and a half to fourteen million sterling or an increase of over eight hundred per cent. (Owen, 1969: 89)

The profitability of cotton during this period was so high that most cultivators, large and small, devoted at least part of their land to its production. By 1864, one million feddans or forty per cent of the total cultivated area in the Egyptian Delta was producing cotton. (Owen, 1969: 103) Cotton, however, is an expensive crop to produce and particularly so for the small peasant-producers who substituted cotton for their usual subsistence crops and therefore needed cash in order to survive until harvest time. This is due to the fact that cotton cultivation is characterised by a long growing period - eight months - and it conflicts with the cultivation of the traditional subsistence crops.

The money necessary to finance the cultivation of cotton came from a variety of sources. In the case of the peasants they borrowed the cash they needed from the rapidly multiplying number of village usurers, (mostly Greeks). The latter, in turn, either had links with Greek and other mercantile houses in Istanbul or Alexandria or had made their capital as village traders, selling manufactured goods to the fellaheen (peasants). The estate-owners, on the other hand, were able to obtain advances from banks and other credit institutions against land or cotton. (Owen, 1969: 105-6)

It was a situation in which village usurers, many of them Greeks, stood to make vast profits. They borrowed money from Alexandria merchants at between ten and fifteen per cent per year and they then advanced it to the small peasant-producers at three or four per cent per month. It should also be noted at this point that despite the presence of large estates, the majority of agricultural production was carried out on
small family plots which had been secured by various tenancy agreements
with the large landlords. (Salih, 1979) Thus, the potential clientele
for these village usurers was considerable.

Another aspect of this period, largely due to the cotton boom, was the
accelerated increase in the numbers of Europeans arriving in Egypt. An
idea of this European influx may be gained from the figures recorded by
the Alexandria port passport administration:

...which show that between the beginning of February and the
beginning of August 1864 there was an excess of arrivals over
departures of nearly 12,000 foreigners, including 1,873 Greeks,
1,650 Englishmen, 1,187 Frenchmen, and 1,061 Austrians,
bringing the total European population of the country to
roughly 90,000. (Owen, 1969: 113)

With the end of the American Civil War, however, the cotton boom
suddenly collapsed and several firms went bankrupt while others suffered
great losses. Nevertheless, Khedive Isma'il who had come to the throne
in 1864 encouraged by many European financiers and entrepreneurs,
"...planned to develop to the full the potentialities of the country and
to endow it, in the shortest possible space of time, with all the moral
and material advantages of a new age. Instead of reducing expenditure
he increased it enormously, and attempted to find the funds by
borrowing". (Crouchley, 1938: 116) A number of European bankers,
financiers and entrepreneurs, who had made fortunes during the cotton
boom period, were ready to advance the funds needed for the
modernisation of Egyptian society. After all, Lancashire was still
expanding and needed cotton while Egypt produced a fine quality crop.
The result was that the influx of Europeans continued to increase and so
did the number of European enterprises. In addition to their
involvement with the production and circulation of cotton, many of these
Europeans engaged themselves in the various projects intended to
modernise Egyptian society. These included such areas as banking and finance, foreign trade, construction, city amenities, railroads, roads, theatres, etc.

As cotton exports and prices had dropped by more than fifty per cent from 1866 to 1867 (Owen, 1969: 126), most of these grand projects had to be undertaken on large loans contracted by the Egyptian State. By 1873, the Egyptian State had borrowed from European banks a total of sixty-eight and a half million Egyptian pounds, but in fact only forty-six and a half million Egyptian pounds was received by the Egyptian Treasury. This is because in all the loans contracted in Paris and London, the interest and commission was deducted immediately and only the balance credited to the Egyptian State. For example, in 1873, Egypt contracted a loan of thirty-two million Egyptian pounds with the banker Oppenheim, but after interest, at fourteen per cent, and commission was deducted, the Egyptian Treasury received only twenty million Egyptian pounds. (Crouchley, 1938: 121) It should also be pointed out that of the total borrowed from overseas, forty-four million Egyptian pounds or sixty-five per cent of the total had been contracted with Oppenheim and the rest with four large institutions, Fruhling and Goschen, Anglo-Egyptian, Banque Imperial Ottoman, and Bishoffsheim. (Crouchley, 1938: 122) Thus, it could be argued that one banker, Oppenheim, in fact, controlled Egypt's financial destiny in 1873.

This precarious financial situation deteriorated rapidly when the Ottoman Empire declared itself bankrupt in 1874. This had immediate repercussions on Egypt's credit worthiness. By 1875 Khedive Isma'il was forced to sell the 176,602 shares in the Suez Canal which were held by the Egyptian State to the British government, for almost four million pounds sterling, in order to meet the demands of his European creditors.
Thus, in addition to the British and other European bankers, the British government, having taken the unprecedented step of using public funds to buy commercial shares in another country, became an additional interested party in Egypt's financial future. It is not surprising, therefore, that soon thereafter Stephen Cave, a British financier and Paymaster-General, was dispatched to Egypt by the British cabinet in order to examine her financial situation.

Rothstein points out that the decision to send Stephen Cave, taken two days after the purchase of the Suez Canal shares on the 27th of November, 1875, highlighted the fact that "the purchase of the shares was a political act intended to create for England a preponderating and undisputed title to the possession of Egypt, should the Ottoman Empire be broken up, as then seemed likely". Stephen Cave was briefed by Lord Derby on the 6th of December, 1875, and he departed for Egypt. By the 4th of January, 1876, rumours of his mission had been leaked and the London and Paris Stock Exchanges were panic-stricken. This forced the French government also to send her own representative, Mr Outrey, who had been a former Consul-General in Egypt. The presence of two high ranking European government officials in Egypt, examining her financial situation, increased the panic in the European Stock Exchanges and credit to Egypt was entirely cut off. The Egyptian State could no longer renew the Treasury bonds and on the 6th of April, 1876, declared bankruptcy.

This led to the decree of May 2nd, 1876, by which an institution denominated the "Caisse de la Dette Publique" was established, under the direction of foreign commissioners nominated by their respective governments with the mandate of receiving direct from the local authorities the revenues affected to the service of the debt, and maintaining the
It is during this critical period in Egypt's modern economic and political history that the third wave of Greek emigration to Alexandria took place. As indicated above these two decades were a period during which vast fortunes could be made in a short space of time. Furthermore, it should also be noted that though conditions were favourable for all European bankers and financiers, the Greeks came in larger numbers and with the intention of settling in Egypt. Thus, although it was European financial capital, especially British, which dominated the Egyptian economy, it was Greek merchants, financiers and entrepreneurs who implemented and controlled the majority of the projects initiated during this period. This rapid increase in the numbers of Greeks in Egypt also reflected itself in the closer ties between the Egyptian and Greek governments, both of whom were attempting to secure greater independence from the Ottoman Empire and develop their respective economies. In fact, in 1866, there were extensive discussions between the two countries, at the level of Prime Minister, initiated partially by the Cretan struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire, in order to explore the possibilities of an economic and political alliance that could eventually lead to some form of union. (Politis, 1931b) The proposed project did not materialise, but as will be shown in the following six biographies of prominent Greeks from Alexandria, the relations between the two countries developed rapidly.

1. George Averoff (né Avierinos)

One of the most prominent emigrants to Alexandria during this period was George Averoff who served as President of the Greek community of Alexandria from 1885 until his death on the 15th of July, 1899. Averoff
was born in Metsovón, Epiros in Northern Greece, on the 15th of August, 1818, in a relatively prosperous family. During his childhood he worked with his father who at that time had about three thousand sheep. With the start of the Greek Revolution in 1821, the family's economic situation deteriorated as a result of Ottoman measures taken against those Greeks still under their control. His five older brothers were forced to emigrate and the oldest went to Russia where he worked in Russo-Balkan trade and amassed a large fortune. It was there that the older brother changed his name from Avierinos to Averoff and subsequently the rest of the family adopted the new name.

Having achieved considerable economic success, the oldest brother encouraged and assisted three of his other brothers to settle in Egypt. The three Averoff brothers settled in Cairo in the early 1830s and specialised in transit trade between the Sudan and Britain; Sudanese cotton in exchange for British textiles. George Averoff, who was the youngest, did not join his brothers until 1841 which also coincided with the start of the decline of Muhammad 'Ali's economic ventures and especially his State monopolies. Thus, Muhammad 'Ali started to tax such areas as transit trade in order to supplement the State Treasury revenue. Given the new situation, the three older brothers returned to Greece while George remained and continued the family business without much success. It appears that he could only afford one man-servant who also assisted him in his business and he did not even have a warehouse. During the 1850s George Averoff started to work in the Egyptian cotton trade, but was unable to make much profit because it was the Alexandria merchants who had a virtual monopsony in this area.

In 1865, at the height of the cotton boom, George Averoff's situation changed dramatically. In that year a severe cholera epidemic spread
throughout the city of Cairo and forced most of the foreign merchants to abandon their goods and flee to Alexandria. The records indicate that out of a population of three hundred and fifty thousand, there were approximately one to one and a half thousand deaths per day. Averoff, who had no family to concern him, stayed behind and purchased large quantities of cotton from the fleeing merchants at very low prices. Egyptian cotton, however, still fetched high prices on the world market and so Averoff was able to realise a vast profit at the end of the 1865 cotton season; one hundred and twenty thousand Egyptian pounds. With his newly acquired wealth, he moved to Alexandria at the end of 1865 and immediately entered the elite social circles of the prominent Greek merchants in that city.

The first indication of his newly acquired social position was the listing of his name along with other prominent Greeks as a contributor of one thousand sterling towards the Cretan struggle for independence in 1866. Averoff's acute financial capabilities assisted him once more during the period 1875 to 1882. Given the economic and political instability after Egypt's bankruptcy, the value of Egyptian government bonds and the price of real estate and agricultural land dropped dramatically. Averoff purchased large quantities of all three; bonds in Alexandria's public amenities, agricultural land in the Delta and urban real estate in Alexandria. After the British military occupation of 1882, the value of all three increased rapidly and overtook their pre-1875 values. Thus, by 1884, George Averoff was one of the wealthiest Greeks in Alexandria and he was elected Vice-President of the Greek community. The following year, Rallis was forced to resign and Averoff became President.
It is important to note that although Averoff took advantage of the prevailing economic climate and upheavals in order to accumulate his large fortune, he worked alone and did not participate in any of the limited companies or other enterprises that were being established at the time by many European financiers and bankers. Thus, it is possible to suggest that the pattern of economic activities adopted by Averoff was more akin to that of the early Greek merchants, Tossitsas and Zizinias, rather than that of the second generation Greek financiers, Choremis, who participated in European financial enterprises. Furthermore, Averoff, who was a relative of Tossitsas, also saw himself as a guardian of the ethnic identity of the Greek community. This was demonstrated in 1887 when he donated ten thousand pounds sterling to pay half of the debts incurred by the community in renovating property that had been damaged in the events of 1882. The Greek community had not received compensation from Britain, due to its anti-British attitude, and was compelled to borrow from commercial banks who were presently threatening to send the bailiffs. Furthermore, as President of the community, he was instrumental in formalising the independence of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Alexandria from the Ottoman-controlled Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Istanbul. Henceforth, the Alexandria Patriarch was appointed by the Alexandria Greek community who was also responsible for all the affairs of the Patriarchate, whose jurisdiction extended throughout Africa.

This act of safeguarding and extending the ethnic interests of the Greek community in Alexandria placed Averoff prominently as one of the leading figures in the history of the Greek community in Alexandria and Egypt in general. Averoff, however, did not restrict his financial contributions to safeguarding the ethnic identity of the Alexandria community. In
1896, at the time of the first modern Olympics, Averoff paid the entire costs of constructing the marble stadium in Athens and thus ensured that the games were held in Greece. Later he contributed twenty thousand pounds sterling to the transformation of the engineering school that had been established by Michalis Tossitsas into the Metsovion Polytechnic, since both men came from Metsovon, and to the present day it is one of the leading institution of higher education in Greece. Averoff also established a military academy and an agricultural school in Larissa, Northern Greece, and donated fifty-six thousand sterling for the construction of the first modern Greek battleship which was named after him. The Averoff was the flagship of the Greek fleet until the 1950s and to the present day it is anchored in Faliron, near Athens, and used for all formal occasions by the Greek Navy. Along with the large Averoff fortune, these contributions were exploited by his descendants in helping them achieve a prominent status in Greek politics during the twentieth century.

2. Konstantinos Salvagos

Konstantinos Salvagos was born in Marseilles in 1845, where his father, Michalis, was a prosperous merchant trading in Egyptian cotton. It was in this connection and due to the cotton boom that Konstantinos came to Alexandria in 1865 in order to establish a branch of the Michalis Salvagos and Sons firm. Konstantinos quickly made large profits and established his own firm, K M Salvagos and Co. Though he continued to trade in cotton, his primary concerns were financial and in this capacity contributed to the establishment of several banking and financial enterprises. It should be noted, however, that all these enterprises, such as the National Bank of Egypt (actually established initially in his offices), the Alexandria Water Company, the Alexandria
Ramleh Railway Company Limited, the Société Anonyme du Behera, the Filature Nationale d'Egypt, and various others, were controlled by British capital.

Given his economic and social position and the general pro-British climate that prevailed in Egypt after 1882, he was elected as a second Vice-President, along with Averoff, by the Greek community in 1884, and became President in 1900. His early death in 1901 meant that he did not play much of a role in the affairs of the community. It was his wife and son who established the Salvagos School for Commerce in his memory in 1907, at the cost of sixteen and a half thousand Egyptian pounds. It was his son, Mikes, who was born in Alexandria in 1875, who inherited the family estate. Mikes received his early education in Alexandria and then went to Paris to read law.

Mikes Salvagos followed in his father's footsteps and expanded the family financial enterprises which permitted him to occupy several prestigious social positions in the city such as President of the Muhammad 'Ali club, Vice-President of the Egyptian Industrialists Association, and member of the Higher Economic Council of the Egyptian State. As was the case with his father, all three organisations were pro-British and had been established after 1882. His political orientation was also reflected by the fact that he was President of the board in a number of British controlled enterprises, some of which his father had helped establish. These included the Alexandria Water Company, the Alexandria and Ramleh Railway Company Limited, the Filature Nationale d'Egypte, the Société Anonyme du Behera, the Société Egyptienne de l'Industrie de la Bonneterie, the Société Egyptienne des Industries Textiles, and the Land Bank of Egypt. He was also Vice-President of the Gabbari Land Company and the Société Anonyme de
Mikes Salvagos achieved a prominent position as a financier and his participation in a number of financial ventures made him a wealthy person. This status, reflecting as it did the new economic climate prevalent in Alexandria, permitted him to be elected Vice-President of the Greek community in 1911. In 1919, he became President. He occupied this position until 1944 when he resigned. During this twenty-five year period, the Greek community adopted a clear pro-British attitude and reflected primarily the interests of the Greek bankers and financiers in Alexandria.

3. Emmanuil Benakis

Emmanuil Benakis was born on the island of Siros in 1844, and received his primary education there before he emigrated to England, where he completed only a year and a half of secondary studies at Wimerslow school near Manchester. In 1865, he emigrated to Egypt and worked for a Greek cotton-exporting firm in Alexandria, Skilitsi, as an agent purchasing cotton in the villages. By 1868, and due to the cotton boom, he and his brother, Loukas, were able to establish their own cotton-exporting firm in Alexandria. Emmanuil Benakis' fate changed dramatically in 1870 when he married the younger sister of Ioannis Choremis, Virginia, and was appointed as a director in the Choremis-Davis-Mellor and Co. firm. In that same year he was sent to Liverpool
to establish a branch of the firm. By 1876, and after Davis and Mellor had left the firm, he returned to Alexandria as an equal partner in a new firm now called Choremi-Benaki and Co. This new partnership immediately guaranteed him a high economic and social status in the city and a prominent position among the Greek merchants and financiers. His political orientation became public knowledge when he was appointed by the British military to the Comité d'Elite in 1882. This was a civil organisation established by the British military to assist them in administering the city of Alexandria immediately after they had occupied it. Later, when Lord Cromer established the City Council, he was also elected to its governing board.

Benakis also occupied several other prestigious posts such as President of the Muhammad 'Ali Club, which was a pro-British socio-political association, member of the executive committee of the Khedive's Agricultural Society, which considered all matters pertaining to the cultivation of cotton, and member of the governing council of the Egyptian Cotton-Ginners Company Limited, which was responsible for regulating all cotton ginning enterprises in Egypt. This, of course, was in addition to being a partner in the largest cotton-exporting firm in Alexandria by the end of the century. As was the case with several other Greeks who arrived during this period, Benakis was also an important financier in the city. He was on the governing council of various British controlled financial enterprises such as the National Bank of Egypt, the National Insurance Company of Egypt, the Egyptian Salt and Soda Company, and various others.

Given his economic, social and political position the Greek community elected him as Vice-President, along with Averoff, in 1884. In 1901, he became President. During his tenure as President the Greek community
experienced a certain degree of physical expansion due primarily to his
donation of a large piece of urban real estate, eighty-eight thousand
square yards. On this land, Benakis constructed an orphanage and a
public kitchen for the poor Greeks of Alexandria which cost him twenty
thousand Egyptian pounds. These institutions were inaugurated in 1909
and 1908 respectively. Both institutions were administered by his wife,
Virginia, who was also the director of a number of other charities in
the city. Furthermore, he was instrumental in establishing the Greek
Chamber of Commerce in Alexandria in 1901, and became its first
President. This was an important development because it permitted both
the Greek government and the British authorities in Egypt to influence
and control the activities of the Greek merchants, bankers and
financiers in Alexandria. This particular endeavour was cited as one of
the principal reasons why Venizelos, Greek Prime Minister, appointed
him Minister for Agriculture and Trade in 1911. At that time Venizelos
was attempting to consolidate his relations with Britain as a means of
counteracting the pro-German Greek Royal family and appointing Benakis
was helpful in this direction. This is in addition to the fact that
Benakis was given the task of introducing cotton cultivation into Greek
agriculture which Venizelos hoped would revitalise Greek agriculture and
also produce foreign currency revenues for the State Treasury.

Benakis remained in the Greek cabinet until Venizelos lost the next
elections in 1915, and was then elected Mayor of Athens as an
independent. It was in his capacity as Mayor that he made a number of
significant contributions to cultural, educational and social
institutions in Athens. When he died in 1929, he was succeeded by his
five children, two of whom were males. His three daughters married the
sons of Choremis, Salvagos and Deltas, all wealthy Greeks from
Alexandria. His older son, Alexander, died at a young age, so it was Antonis who inherited the family fortune. Antonis' only public role in Alexandria and in Greece was that he established the Greek Boy Scouts Association in both places in 1924 and 1926 respectively.

4. Theocharis Kotsikas

Theocharis Kotsikas was born in the port-town of Karistos, Evoia, in 1857. He studied at the Athens School of Commerce and at Athens University and at the age of seventeen became director of customs in Karistos. A year later, in 1875, he emigrated to Alexandria where he worked in general commerce. When the British mounted a military campaign to re-conquer the Sudan at the end of the century, Kotsikas got the contract of supplying the troops with all the necessary provisions and in the process accumulated a large fortune. Ironically, Kotsikas used the profits from this venture to introduce and develop the manufacture of alcoholic beverages in Alexandria, an industry which was actively discouraged by Lord Cromer. Thus, Kotsikas confronted many obstacles in his attempt to establish this industry and had to go on relying on his commercial activities, as a major supplier to the British forces in Egypt and the Sudan, in order to generate the necessary capital needed for investment in the alcohol industry.

Theocharis Kotsikas was an important benefactor of the Greek community although he never held office on the governing council which was almost entirely controlled by Greek bankers and financiers after 1899. His most important contribution was the construction of a Greek hospital which at the time of its inauguration, in 1938, was the largest and most modern hospital in Alexandria. The hospital and all the equipment cost two hundred and fifty thousand Egyptian pounds. He also donated fifty
thousand Egyptian pounds as an endowment fund for its administrative expenses. It appears that Kotsikas did not trust the Greeks running the community affairs as the ownership of the Theocaris Kotsikas Hospital was given to the Greek State and its administration was left to the Greek community. This represented a radical break from the tradition of making all donations to the Greek community itself, but it also reflected the growing tension, post-World War I, between those Greeks who were keen to embark on manufacturing and those who wished to maintain banking and finance as the principal activity of Greeks in Alexandria. Of course, British policy in Egypt was to discourage any attempt at initiating a manufacturing sector.

5. Ioannis Laghoudakis

Ioannis Laghoudakis arrived in Egypt in 1876, and first settled in Cairo. Due to the deteriorating political situation, he moved to Alexandria the following year. In Alexandria he imported from Europe, in large quantities, cigarette paper for rolling tobacco and with the assistance of two Egyptian workers, he packaged it into smaller quantities and sold it in the various villages in the Delta. In 1882, during the British bombardment of Alexandria, his workshop was destroyed and with the compensation he received from the British authorities, he established a more sophisticated manufacture which in fact produced cigarette paper. This was the first time that paper was being produced in any significant quantity in Egypt and thus Laghoudakis pioneered a whole new manufacturing sector. As owner of the first paper industry he was able to accumulate considerable wealth and become one of the most prosperous Greeks in Alexandria. Nevertheless, as was the case with
Kotsikas, he was excluded from the running of the Greek community affairs.

The exclusion of Laghoudakis from community affairs encouraged him to establish an alternative Greek community in Ibrahimiyya, a section of Alexandria, which was inhabited by working class and poor Greeks. This alternative Greek community within the confines of the city of Alexandria was supported by a number of other Greeks who were engaged in the developing manufacturing sector, either as capitalists or as workers through their trade unions. Laghoudakis also made significant contributions to a number of Greek socio-political associations in Alexandria such as the Aischelus-Arion Society and the Cretan Society. His most important contribution, however, was the donation of five thousand Egyptian pounds towards the establishment of Faruq University in Alexandria. This university was established by a number of prosperous nationalist Egyptians and a few other foreigners in response to the establishment of Fu'ad University in Cairo by the British. Both universities are the leading academic institutions in Egypt today under their new names, Alexandria University and Cairo University. Ioannis Laghoudakis died in 1919, and his son Konstantinos inherited his paper industry. By the time Konstantinos died in December, 1945, the Laghoudakis paper industry was one of the largest throughout the Middle East.

6. Ioannis Zerbinis

Ioannis Zerbinis was born on the island of Mytilini in 1854, and emigrated to Egypt at the age of seventeen after his father died in 1871. In Egypt he worked with his paternal uncle who was a prosperous usurer working in a number of villages in the Delta. When his uncle
died in 1873, Zerbinis settled in the village of Tukh, thirty kilometres from Kafr al-Zayyat and the largest cotton-trading centre in the Delta, and worked in the cotton trade. The greatest part of the cotton produced in the area, however, was already controlled by other Greek merchants who had been in Kafr al-Zayyat for some time. In particular it was such merchant/usurers as Psychas, Tamvacooulos, Rodocanachi, Voltos, Casulli, Dimitriou, and agents for Choremi-Benaki and Zervoudachis. Thus, by 1876, Zerbinis was forced to move to Kafr al-Zayyat and work for these larger merchants. It was under such conditions that Zerbinis decided that he might just as well volunteer, in 1878, to go and fight in the insurrection against the Ottomans that had started in Thesalia, Northern Greece. He joined a group of volunteers from Alexandria which had been organised and led by George G housios, a prosperous Greek banker in that city.

During the campaign G housios was wounded and Zerbinis saved his life. Since G housios was General Director of the Anglo-Egyptian Bank in Alexandria, this brought its own reward. After the events of 1882, G housios was able to convince several wealthy Egyptian landowners, and especially Lutfallah Sursuk, to invest the necessary capital so that Zerbinis could establish a cotton-ginning plant in Kafr al-Zayyat. Twelve years later, however, Zerbinis had yet to break into the monopoly already established by the other Greek cotton ginners, so he used the capital initially raised by G housios to purchase six presses in 1895, with which he started to extract oil from the cotton seeds. By 1897, he also purchased a machine to manufacture soap from the cotton seeds and by December in the same year he was able to double the size of his factory. Thus, a new and important industrial sector had been initiated in Egypt.
Ioannis Zerbinis, who was the principal director and major shareholder of the Kafr al-Zayyat Cotton Co. Ltd. since its establishment in 1894, continued to expand his enterprises. By 1914, he had moved to Alexandria and established a new factory. Soon, thereafter, Zerbinis became one of wealthiest Greek industrialists in that city and his descendants controlled one of the largest and most profitable sectors of Egyptian industry until 1961, when it was nationalised by Nasir. Nevertheless, Ioannis Zerbinis never held any office in the Greek community of Alexandria. It was not until December, 1948, after the political situation had drastically changed in Egypt, that his descendant, Dimitris Zerbinis, was elected President of the Greek community in Alexandria.

The above discussion of the biographies of six Greek emigrants to Alexandria during the period 1861 to 1882 highlights some of the particular socio-economic and political characteristics of a certain category of Greeks that settled in Egypt during the nineteenth century. The biographies suggest that these six Greeks can be sub-divided into three groups: first, an emigrant such as Averoff who relied on individual initiatives in order to accumulate a large fortune, achieved a prominent social status in Alexandria, and devoted much of his energy and wealth to the development of the ethnic identity of the Greek community in Alexandria and Greece; second, emigrants such as Benakis and Salvagos who accumulated their wealth through a close working association with the interests of British capital in Egypt, achieved a prominent social status in Alexandria, but did not contribute significantly to the development of the Greek community in that city; and third, emigrants such as Kotsikas, Laghoudakis and Zerbinis who were forced, by virtue of the prevailing circumstances, to pioneer the
industrial sector, and thus did not achieve a prominent economic or social position in the city until after the decline of British economic and political influence in Egypt in the 1930s.

Nevertheless, the general characteristics of this group of six Greek emigrants to Alexandria also reflect the general characteristics not only of the other life histories presented in this chapter, but also of the wave of Greek emigration towards Europe during the second half of the eighteenth century. Thus, it is possible to identify two central features that are common to both the patterns of Greek emigration towards Europe in the eighteenth century and Greek emigration towards Egypt in the nineteenth century.

The first feature is that related to the economic factors and forces which encouraged their emigration in the first place. In general it can be deduced from the previous discussion that most Greeks, belonging to this socio-economic category, abandoned the Ottoman Empire in order to improve their economic position and take advantage of important economic transformations taking place in either Europe or Egypt. In other words, these Greek emigrants were quite aware of both the restrictions prevailing in the Ottoman Empire and the opportunities available in the country of their destination. Their emigration was not part of a general exodus, as was the case of the Armenians in the early twentieth century, but a specific response by a particular socio-economic category of Greeks to particular transformations related to the development and expansion of European capitalism during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It can, therefore, be concluded that despite the different socio-economic and political specificities, highlighted in the above discussion, all these Greek emigrants also reflect the same general
characteristics of the wider developments and transformations being initiated on a global scale by European capitalism during this period.

The second feature is related to the ethnic socio-cultural and political role and attitude exemplified by the Greeks emigrating towards Europe and those whose biographies were discussed above. On the one hand, it was those merchants, who emigrated towards Europe in the eighteenth century, and identified with the new socio-economic and political forces generated by European capitalism, who played a central role in initiating and carrying out the Greek Revolution of 1821. On the other hand, however, it was those Greeks who did not have to work closely with the new European economic and political forces, exemplified in Egypt by British economic and political interests, that exhibited a paramount concern for the ethnic identity of the Greek community in Alexandria and the development of Greece. Thus, as it has already been indicated in the introduction an association with the new socio-economic and political forces generated by European capitalism, in Europe and the eastern Mediterranean, did not necessarily produce identical ethnic socio-cultural responses among all the Greeks emigrating from the Ottoman Empire during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. For example, although Stefanos Zizinias took advantage of the impact of the new European economic forces in Egypt, he simultaneously adopted a socio-cultural and political attitude which ran counter to the interests of the representatives of European capitalism in Egypt, namely the British Consul-General. This is in sharp contrast to the Greek merchants in Europe who received considerable support from the European powers, England and France, in accomplishing their political objective to liberate Greece.
This apparent paradox can only be explained by reference to the specific characteristics within which each Greek migrant achieved a prominent economic and social position. For example, it has to be noted that in Egypt, European capitalism also took the form of European colonialism whose objective was the subjugation and control of Egyptian society. Greek merchants, therefore, who accumulated wealth through a close association with Egyptian socio-economic and political structures, albeit in the wider context of the expansion of European capitalism, were inadvertently placed in a situation where they had to challenge the developing socio-economic and political hegemony of European capital. This was in distinct contrast to the situation of the Greek Revolution of 1821, where European economic and political forces were keen to support the Greeks as a means of undermining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Thus, the socio-economic and political interests of both Greek merchants and European capitalism were identical in Europe.

It is possible to conclude, therefore, that socio-cultural and political attitudes reflect the specificity of the historical period, geographical location and the particularities of each life history, rather than the general socio-economic trends of European capitalism. Thus, it is possible to relate the general mode of economic activity that characterised the Greeks in Alexandria to the general pattern of economic transformations experienced by Egypt, during the nineteenth century, as a result of her incorporation into a global capitalist market and international division of labour. An understanding of their socio-political (ideological) orientation, however, requires the identification of the specificity of each stage of Egypt's modern history. The above discussion has already indicated that the fourteen case studies, at least, were characterised by ideological diversity.
rather than homogeneity. In order to elaborate on this diversity and the nature of the economic activities of the Greeks in Alexandria during the nineteenth century, it is also necessary to present a more detailed discussion of the economic activities of these Greeks and other prominent members of the community in Alexandria. This discussion, however, which appears in chapter four, needs to be located within an account of Egyptian economic history which elaborates some of the general characteristics already mentioned above. This constitutes the focus of the following chapter.
1. Unless otherwise indicated, all the information included in the following biographies has been pieced together from various accounts found in the archives of the Greek Community of Alexandria under the heading: Major Benefactors. These archives are described under the appropriate section of the References. Furthermore, it should be noted that many of the facts presented here are also presented in chapters four and five in the context of other discussions. In chapters four and five, of course, the particular sources - other than the archives - from which the facts are extracted are recorded. Thus, it is possible to argue that most of the facts extracted from the archives and used in the biographies are corroborated by other sources.

2. In addition to the material in the Alexandria Greek community archives, this section also relies on the large number of biographical and literary studies devoted to Konstantinos Cavafy, in particular, the work of Stratis Tsirkas (1971 & 1973), another prominent modern Greek literary figure (novelist) from Alexandria, and the main translator of Cavafy into English, Edmund Keeley (1976).
CHAPTER THREE

Formation of a Peripheral Economy:
Aspects of the Transformation of the Egyptian Economy

Historically, Egypt has been an agrarian society, and agriculture has constituted the primary concern of the productive economic activities of its inhabitants. This does not imply, of course, that the cultivation of Egypt’s fertile soil has also constituted the sole economic activity, or that all wealth has been generated through the simple cultivation of various crops. On the contrary, the Egyptian economy has for many centuries been characterised by a complex structure combining various productive and non-productive activities. Nevertheless, most of these other activities have either been based on or in some way related to agricultural production. (Owen, 1969: 3-12)

It is during the nineteenth century, however, that the Egyptian economy experienced certain structural transformations which not only constituted a radical break with the past, but also proved to be of central significance in shaping the country’s socio-economic and political development in the twentieth century. These economic transformations conditioned Egypt’s integration into the international division of labour as an agricultural unit and initiated a pattern of economic growth and accumulation which confirmed Egypt’s dependent status in the world economy.

Egypt’s dependence resulted from an essentially agricultural economy, geared almost unilaterally to the cultivation and export of cotton, and from the direct grip of foreign banks and corporations on the country’s main centres of economic activity. The absolute priority given to cultivation for export meant that the principal sectors of the economy were geared not to domestic needs, but to world markets, and were
therefore subject to the fluctuations and crises of these markets. The economy became almost totally dependent on activities related to the financing, trading, transport, and industrial processing of the cotton crop. (Radwan, 1974: 233)

Furthermore, it is possible to suggest that during the nineteenth century the dynamics of the Egyptian economy exemplified two contradictory tendencies which in effect dominated the entire society. (Issa, 1970) The first tendency contributed to the development of Egypt's productive forces and manifested itself in the development of extensive Egyptian State monopolies over the entire economy. The second tendency contributed to the integration of Egypt into the international division of labour and manifested itself in the absolute domination and control of the Egyptian economy by European capital. Although both these tendencies co-existed for most of the nineteenth century, it is possible, for the purpose of this account, to discern two distinct historical periods when only one of the tendencies was predominant: The first is the period 1830 to 1882, when the Egyptian State had a relatively high degree of control over its own economy, and the second is the period 1882 to 1900, when European capital possessed an almost exclusive control over Egyptian economic affairs.

It was during the same two periods that the Greek community in Egypt, and in Alexandria in particular, achieved its prosperity and position of economic importance. In order to elaborate, therefore, on the nature and degree of their achievements and importance it is necessary to highlight the main features of the Egyptian economic transformations during both historical periods. Furthermore, the Greek merchants, financiers and entrepreneurs took advantage of the prevailing trends within the national economy in order to achieve their economic prominence. Thus, it is necessary to present the account of Egyptian
economic history in a manner which highlights the predominant tendencies so as to facilitate the historical contextualisation of the economic activities of the Greeks in Alexandria below in chapter four.
I. Subsistence, Commodity Production and Dependence, 1830 - 1882

During this period Egypt experienced what may be characterised as a minor agricultural revolution. (O'Brien, 1968: 185) This was due to several factors which encouraged a substantial increase in physical output and value in the agrarian sector during these five decades. As the agrarian sector was and still is the most important sector in the economy, it is necessary to examine these transformations in some detail.

1. Agriculture

The most important transformations experienced by this sector during this period were the following: 1. The extension of cultivated and cropped area; 2. The introduction and extension of irrigation works; and 3. The introduction of new crops. Each of these factors will be examined in some detail in turn.

a. The extension of cultivated and cropped area.

Egyptian statistics regarding agricultural land, after the introduction of irrigation works in the early nineteenth century, have usually been presented in two distinct classifications: First, cultivated land, which represents the actual area under cultivation; and Second, cropped land, which takes into account the number of crops produced per year from a particular unit of land. Given the high fertility of Egyptian soil, it is almost always possible to plant more than one crop on the same piece of land during the same year. Thus, the cropped land figure is always greater than the figure for the land actually under cultivation. Table 3.1 clearly indicates that both the cultivated and cropped area experienced a significant increase during this period; cultivated land
increased by 136.4 per cent while cropped land increased by 88.5 per cent. It should be noted, however, that the largest increase in cultivated land, 75.6 per cent, occurred during the Muhammad 'Ali period, 1821 to 1844. Furthermore, the Stephen Cave Commission, headed by a junior member of Disraeli's cabinet and sent to Egypt to examine her financial status, indicated that 4,805,107 feddans of cultivated land were being taxed in 1876, and went on to note that

...352,350 feddans have also been brought under cultivation and will shortly be assessed for taxation [and] a further area of 267,650 feddans will become liable to taxation [while] there are still 1,908,000 feddans of cultivable ground which have been registered but not yet cultivated. (Cave, 1876, quoted in Issawi, 1966: 435)

Table 3.1: Cultivated and Cropped Land, 1821 - 1884
(thousand feddans)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CULTIVATED LAND</th>
<th>CROPPED LAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>2,032</td>
<td>3,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>3,856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>3,569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>4,053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>4,624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>4,804</td>
<td>5,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>4,758</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>5,754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. average for years, 1820 - 1824;
b. average for years, 1870 - 1874;c. average for years, 1880 - 1884


b. The introduction and extension of irrigation works

To a large extent this large increase in cultivated and cropped land was due to the extensive irrigation works carried out during the same period. The aim of the State-initiated irrigation projects was to
introduce perennial irrigation as the standard system for the whole of Egypt. Prior to the Muhammad 'Ali period, the bulk of Egyptian agricultural land was cultivated by means of a system of basin irrigation, and this meant that cultivation was dependent on the flooding of the river Nile which occurred during the summer months. A winter crop was then planted in the silt, which was left behind after the river had subsided in November, and it was harvested the following April. The land, therefore, remained fallow for the period after harvest and until the next Nile flood, that is from May to October. (O'Brien, 1966: 4)

It was Muhammad 'Ali who was keen to extend the productivity of Egyptian agriculture and in particular to introduce summer crops. He "...conceived [of a] plan of converting the Delta from basin to perennial irrigation by covering it with a network of canals deep enough to hold water in summer and numerous enough to supply the whole area with summer water". (Crouchley, 1938: 54) Furthermore, from 1825, he constructed a series of barrages and regulators in the Delta in order to hold back the water and so control its level in the irrigation canals, which in addition to extending the cultivated area and permitting the cultivation of summer crops also controlled the Nile floods which for centuries past had disastrous effects on the social and economic situation of rural Egypt. It was not, however, until 1863 that the irrigation works received primary attention from the State, and during the period 1863 to 1879, an intensive programme of constructing canals was undertaken and eight and a half thousand miles of irrigation canals were completed. (Crouchley, 1938: 131-2)

The construction of these irrigation canals cost 12.6 million Egyptian pounds which amounted to twenty-five per cent of total State expenditure
The result of this massive State investment in irrigation works was that by 1880, the whole of the Delta and a large part of Upper Egypt had been converted to perennial irrigation. It should also be noted that this State investment represented practically the total investment in agriculture during this period. Agricultural investment by the peasants themselves was minimal and consisted primarily of rudimentary tools and draught animals. Furthermore, the peasants did not use any chemical fertilizers, preferring to use animal manure which was available from their own animals.

c. The introduction of new crops

One of the most important consequences of the introduction of perennial irrigation, in addition to the extension of the cultivated and cropped area, was that it permitted the introduction of summer crops and in particular the cultivation of cotton. Prior to 1820, long-staple cotton was unknown in Egypt. It was Louis Alexis Jumel, a French textile engineer, who experimented with various Sudanese cotton plants in his Cairo garden between 1817 and 1819, and eventually succeeded in producing a hybrid cotton crop that would grow on Egyptian soil. At the end of the first Egyptian cotton season, in 1820, Jumel had produced three bales of cotton from his own garden and a year later he had embarked on a commercial scale and produced two thousand bales with the financial assistance of an Alexandria mercantile enterprise, Messrs. Gibara. (Owen, 1969: 28)

Muhammad 'Ali, who was keen to develop and extend his mercantile interests, was quick to realise the commercial value of this new crop
and gave it all his support. In fact, it could be argued that much of the irrigation work was initiated specifically for the purpose of enabling the extensive cultivation of this one summer crop, cotton. Within three decades of Jumel planting the first crop, cotton had become the primary cash crop in Egypt and thus initiated a series of profound structural changes in all sectors of the Egyptian economy and society. The introduction of cotton was clearly the primary factor in the agricultural revolution experienced by Egypt during these five decades. In addition to cotton, however, the introduction of perennial irrigation also enabled the extended cultivation of other commercially lucrative crops such as indigo and sesame. (Owen, 1969: 47-9)

The most important consequence, in commercial terms, of the increase in the cultivable and cropped area and the introduction of an extensive irrigation system was the concomitant growth in overall agricultural output. In order to elaborate on this aspect of agrarian transformation, it is necessary to examine the production figures for the eight major crops that were grown in Egypt during this period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>COTTON</th>
<th>SUGAR-CANE</th>
<th>WHEAT</th>
<th>MAIZE</th>
<th>BARLEY</th>
<th>BEANS</th>
<th>LENTILS</th>
<th>RICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-5</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-8</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O'Brien, 1968: 179

The above table clearly indicates that there was a considerable increase in agricultural output which primarily concentrated during the period 1830 to 1878. Furthermore, the figures show that cotton and sugar-cane experienced the largest growth while rice, which had been Egypt's primary export crop prior to 1821, was the only crop whose growth in fact declined. This was primarily due to the fact that rice was grown
in the Delta and was thus placed in direct competition with the new commercially lucrative crop, cotton. Sugar-cane, however, was cultivated in the southern part of Upper Egypt where summer crops, such as cotton, could not be grown since perennial irrigation had yet to be introduced.

Patrick O'Brien aggregated the above figures and was able to determine the increase in over-all agricultural output in value terms for this period. It should be pointed out, however, that O'Brien aggregated the figures in terms of the value of each crop in order to avoid over-all agricultural production being determined by the heaviest crop rather than the most valuable. With the base year 1821 being allocated the figure of 100, O'Brien's calculations indicate an increase to 164 for the period 1830 to 1835, and an astonishing increase to 1,208 for the period 1872 to 1878. (O'Brien, 1968: 177-80)

Although the above figures indicate that agricultural output experienced substantial growth in value terms, it is possible that this was due solely to the extension of the cultivated and cropped area and the natural increase of the rural population during the same period. It is for this reason that the above figures need to be examined in the context of indices reflecting the increases experienced in cultivated and cropped land and the rural population. Indices for the former have already been presented above, thus it is necessary to examine the population figures for this period.

Population statistics for this period of Egyptian modern history are highly unreliable, but it is possible to present some of the existing estimated figures as a means of indicating the nature of quantitative change rather than any absolute account of actual population increase.
The estimates produced by the Englishman James Craig and the Frenchman Boinet have been used by many economic historians as the most reliable and so will be presented below.

Table 3.3 suggests that there was a substantial increase in population during the Muhammad 'Ali period, 1800 to 1846, which suggests that the extension of the cultivated area during the same period encouraged population growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CRAIG</th>
<th>BOINET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800-21</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821-46</td>
<td>22.99</td>
<td>31.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-82</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-82</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: quoted in O'Brien, 1968: 176

In fact, Crouchley suggests that the Egyptian population doubled during a period of twenty-six years, increasing from 2,536,400 to 4,476,446 between 1821 to 1847. (Crouchley, 1938: 51) The increase for the rest of the period under consideration was less rapid and by 1876 it had only reached 5,250,000. (Crouchley, 1938: 125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>RURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>2,514</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-5</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>4,463</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>4,402</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>5,252</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>4,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>5,517</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>4,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O'Brien, 1968: 174. [Rural population figures derive from the total minus urban population figures]
It should be pointed out that the estimated figures available also show that urban population increased at a higher rate than rural population, and that during the period 1846 to 1875 this difference was quite substantial.

Table 3.5: Increases of Urban and Rural Population, 1821 - 1875 (Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
<th>RURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821-46</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-75</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821-78</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: calculated from Table 3.4

Having presented the available estimates for population increase during this period, it is now possible to examine with some degree of accuracy the actual indices of agricultural growth.

Table 3.6: Indices of Agricultural Growth, 1821 - 1878

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>AGRICULTURAL OUTPUT</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>RURAL POPULATION</th>
<th>CULTIVATED LAND</th>
<th>CROPPED LAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-5</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-8</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O'Brien, 1968: 40

Table 3.7: Indices of Agricultural Growth, 1821 - 1878

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PER CAPITA FARM OUTPUT</th>
<th>FARM OUTPUT PER HEAD OF RURAL POP.</th>
<th>FARM OUTPUT PER UNIT OF CULTIVATED</th>
<th>FARM OUTPUT PER UNIT OF CROPPED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872-8</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O'Brien, 1968: 41

The above tables confirm that during the period under consideration, there was an increase of agricultural output as well as an increase of value within the agricultural sector of the Egyptian economy. In fact,
the above figures also confirm the suggestion that from 1830 to 1880 Egypt experienced such substantial transformations that they can be referred to as an agricultural revolution. Furthermore, the figures above also show that an important factor in this revolution was the introduction and extensive cultivation of one summer crop, cotton. For, not only did cotton experience the second largest increase in physical output, after sugar-cane, but it was also the most valuable commercial crop being produced in Egypt during this period. To a large extent, cotton's prominent position was due to the increased demand for this crop in the international market and especially in Britain.

An important implication of this agricultural revolution was the emergence of a social division of labour. Throughout this period the simple commodity production nature of the Egyptian economy was being transformed. For reasons that will be discussed below, this change did not lead to a fully developed capitalist economy, but it did contribute to the development of the internal market. This in turn presupposed the development of a social division of labour which meant that certain rural areas specialised in the cultivation of particular crops. This is in fact what happened during this period. Cotton, for example, was almost exclusively cultivated in the Delta while sugar-cane was mainly grown in Upper Egypt. Furthermore, by 1876, cotton was practically the only crop cultivated on the estates of the aristocracy while peasant producers cultivated cotton and other subsistence crops. In Upper Egypt, the cultivation of sugar-cane was almost exclusively on the estates of Isma'il Pasha, Khedive of Egypt, while peasant producers cultivated cereals. (Salih, 1979)

The rapid development of the social division of labour in Egyptian agriculture greatly enhanced the growth of the internal market and the
rapid commercialisation of the economy. This also contributed to a change in the size of the producing units in this sector of the economy. In general, wealthy landlords attempted to increase the size of their holdings in order to cultivate more cotton. The increase in the size of the landholdings of the wealthier farmers also implied that many peasant producers lost their traditional access to land and were forced to become tenant farmers or day labourers on the larger estates. Although there is little concrete data that would permit an elaboration of this important transformation, some contemporary accounts by European visitors to Egypt seem to confirm it. John Bowring, for example, who visited Egypt in the late 1830s, indicates that

Of late many tracts of land have been transferred to capitalists who have consented to pay the arrears due [taxes], and who in consequence employ the fellahs (peasants) as day labourers, taking from them the responsibility of discharging the land-tax, and of delivering the stipulated quantity of produce at the prices fixed by the pacha [Muhammad 'Ali]. In such cases the wages paid to the fellah seldom exceed 40 paras per day, or 2.5 d. I visited some districts in which from 300 to 800 feddans had been taken by capitalists, and I have reason to believe the investment had been profitable. (Bowring, 1840, quoted in Issawi, 1966: 387-8)

By the 1870s, this process of dispossessing peasant producers led to one third of the rural population becoming landless who, in order to guarantee access to land, had to work as agricultural labour or enter into tenancy agreements with wealthy landlords. (Owen, 1969: 30) Despite the apparent increased availability of rural labour, the wealthy landlords seem to have expanded their estates and intensified the production of cotton that there appears to have developed a labour shortage during this period. Crouchley points out that this shortage became so acute at certain times that it was even considered to import foreign labour. (Crouchley, 1938: 125) Nevertheless, no such scheme was ever put into effect and agricultural output continued to increase.
This would indicate that there must have been an improvement in labour efficiency and thus an intensification of labour exploitation. This of course, also led to an increase in value generated and appropriated during this period.

Furthermore, the discussion above pointed out that the substantial increase in physical output experienced by Egyptian agriculture, was also followed by a significant increase in value generated by this sector of the economy. This suggests that a process of rapid and extensive commercialisation of agricultural commodities must have taken place, for it is only through such a process that substantial increases in physical output could have been transformed into such significant increases in value. It is, therefore, necessary to examine the factors which contributed to this rapid and extensive commercialisation of Egyptian agriculture and especially those factors which permitted cotton to gain such a prominent position in the export sector of the economy.

There were several factors which contributed to this commercialisation process, of which three could be said to be the most important: 1. The development of Egyptian transportation and communication networks; 2. The expansion of commercial activities within Egypt and its international trade with Europe; and 3. The initiation and rapid development of the banking and financial sectors of the Egyptian economy. As was the case with the agricultural sector, these three sectors of the economy also experienced important structural transformations and growth during the period 1830 to 1882. It is necessary, therefore, to examine each one in some detail.
2. Transportation and Telecommunications

This sector experienced important changes and growth during the period under consideration. The primary objectives behind these changes were the concern of the Egyptian State to encourage and facilitate Egypt's external trade and to improve Egyptian postal services in order to increase the efficiency of the communications system between Europe and the Far East which passed through Egyptian territory. (Issawi, 1966: 406) The most important developments in this sector were the construction of railways and the new port in Alexandria.

Two features, in the second half of the 19th century, stand out as the distinguishing marks of economic development throughout the world. These were the construction of railways, and foreign investment on a large scale by western European countries. The two were inter-related. Lending took place largely to governments ostensibly for the construction of railways and ports. In Egypt, as elsewhere, these two features - the development of communications and the rise of the public debt - were to be the dominant features of the period. (Crouchley, 1938: 109-10)

a. Rail and road transportation

By 1877, Egypt possessed more than fifteen hundred kilometres of standard gauge railways, while the ports of Alexandria and Suez had undergone considerable modernisation to the extent that the former had become the most important port in the Near East. (Issawi, 1966: 364) These important developments took place within the general context of improving the entire internal and international transportation system. One of these developments was the improvement of the road network and the restoration of law and order which permitted merchants to transport goods safely over-land. The improved condition and safety of the roads, which was described by a British traveller "...as safe as Yorkshire, and
much safer than many parts of Ireland", contributed to an increase in internal trade. (quoted in Crouchley, 1938: 78) The most important road to be improved was that linking Cairo to Suez which permitted mail and passenger services from Europe to India to use Egypt rather than having to circle Africa. In 1834, the East India Company took advantage of this road improvement and started a steamship line from Bombay to Suez. By 1854, this road was paved with stones and carried a substantial part of the traffic between Europe and India. (al-Hitta, 1957: 220-1)

The first project to construct a railway was put forward in 1834, when it was suggested to connect Cairo to Suez by rail and thus improve the transportation of mail and passengers travelling from Europe to India. Muhammad 'Ali, always suspicious of projects suggested by foreigners, refused to allow the construction to go ahead. It should be pointed out that during this period, the French were already keen to construct a canal that would join Suez to the Mediterranean, while the British favoured a railroad that would join Alexandria to Suez via Cairo. This was primarily due to the fact that the British felt that a canal might pose a threat to India as it would be possible for other European powers to sail directly there rather than having to circle Africa.

It was Muhammad 'Ali's son, however, 'Abbas Hilmi, who was a close friend of Sir Murray, the British Consul-General in Egypt, who decided in favour of the railroad. He asked George Stephenson, son of the famous inventor of the Rocket, and himself a well-known engineer, to construct the first railway in Egypt which would link Alexandria to Cairo. (al-Hitta, 1957: 225) Construction on the railroad started in Alexandria in 1851, it reached Cairo in 1856, and was completed to Suez in 1857. This made Egypt the first country in Africa and the East to have a railroad. (Crouchley, 1938: 109) During the reign of Khedive
Isma'il, 1863 to 1879, more than thirteen million Egyptian pounds, or over twenty five per cent of all State expenditure on public works, were allocated to railroad construction and nine hundred and ten miles were completed. (Crouchley, 1938: 117)

The construction of this railroad network meant that by the end of the 1870s, all the provincial towns in the Delta were connected by a railroad system which terminated at the quay side in the new Alexandria docks. (Crouchley, 1938: 139) Furthermore, the Cairo to Suez line was double-tracked, and two new lines connected Cairo to Assiut in Upper Egypt and to the fertile oasis of Fayyum. (Crouchley, 1938: 140; al-Hitta, 1957: 228) In effect, all the agricultural areas in Egypt were connected by a railway network which terminated at the docks in Alexandria. Sugar-cane from the very southern part of Egypt and cotton from the Delta could be transported with speed and safety to Alexandria for shipment to European ports.

b. River and sea transportation

The railroad network would have placed a heavy burden on the facilities at the Alexandria docks had they not been improved at the same time. As Alexandria and its port had declined in importance during the centuries prior to the nineteenth, the port facilities were such that large cargo vessels arriving from Europe could not dock. Muhammad 'Ali was the first to enlarge and deepen the port in Alexandria and by 1844, a dry dock for major repairs was also constructed. During the period 1863 to 1879, a British firm, Greenfield and Elliot, carried out major improvements, costing a total of over two and a half million Egyptian pounds, or five per cent of all State expenditure on public works during
this period. (Crouchley, 1938: 117) The improvements to the Alexandria docks permitted a rapid increase in the number of vessels using the port.

Table 3.8: Ship Arrivals in Alexandria, 1850 - 1872

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SHIPS</th>
<th>INCREASE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>10.5 †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>2,576</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863-72</td>
<td>3,190*</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) yearly averages
Source: al-Hitta, 1957: 240-3

The above table shows that the number of ships arriving in Alexandria from 1850 to 1872 increased by 76.5 per cent. Furthermore, it should also be pointed out that during the decade 1853 to 1862, seventy-two per cent of all of Egypt's exports passed through Alexandria, while during the decade 1863 to 1872, the volume of trade increased to ninety-four per cent of the total exports. (al-Hitta, 1957: 243)

In addition to the transformations indicated above, this sector of the economy experienced another significant change. On the 15th of December, 1858, the Suez Canal Company was duly constituted for the purpose of constructing and administering a canal that would link the Red Sea to the Mediterranean. Construction did not start until 1863, and the cost of this project for the Egyptian Treasury was sixteen million Egyptian pounds or thirty-one per cent of all State expenditure on public works during the period 1863 to 1879. (Crouchley, 1938: 116)

Another important project that was carried out during this period was the construction of the Mahmudiyya Canal which linked Alexandria to the Rosetta branch of the Nile. This project, which was completed in 1819, was carried out by 313,000 peasant corvée labourers of which twelve
thousand died during the ten months that it took to complete. (al-Hitta, 1957: 221)

River and sea transportation also received considerable attention during this period. By 1872, there were fifty-three steamers and 9,563 sail-powered boats on the Nile and its various canals. (al-Hitta, 1957: 224) Furthermore, by 1873, Egypt was connected to foreign ports by the following shipping lines:

1. Three Egyptian lines, two between Alexandria and Istanbul and one between Suez and Massawa;
2. Five British lines, two between Alexandria and Southampton, two between Suez and Calcutta, and one between Suez and Bombay;
3. Five French lines, of which one linked Alexandria and Marseilles and one linked Marseilles with Hong Kong by way of Port Said and Suez;
4. Four Austrian lines, of which one connected Alexandria to Trieste, one connected Alexandria to Istanbul, and one connected Trieste to Bombay by way of Port Said and Suez;
5. Two Italian lines, one between Alexandria and Genoa and another between Genoa and Bombay which passed through Port Said and Suez;
6. A Russian line from Alexandria to Istanbul and Odessa; and

c. Postal and Telecommunication Services

Another aspect of this sector of the economy that experienced important changes during this period was the telecommunications field. The electric telegraph was introduced in 1854, and by 1863 there were 582 kilometres of telegraph line. (Crouchley, 1938: 140-1) In 1865, Egypt was connected by telegraph to Europe, and from 1863 to 1879, over five thousand kilometres of telegraph lines were laid at the cost of 853,000 Egyptian pounds. (Crouchley, 1938: 117; Owen, 1969: 165) The telephone was introduced to Egypt in 1881, and within a year all the principal cities and towns were connected by both telephone and telegraph lines.
Finally, the Egyptian postal system introduced in 1868 the facility of transmitting money orders of up to eighty Egyptian pounds and gold and silver of any amount to all its branches in Middle and Lower Egypt. (Owen, 1969: 128)
3. Internal Commerce and Foreign Trade

The vast majority of commercial activity up to 1842 was essentially controlled by the Egyptian State through a system of government monopolies. This provided the State with large profits and formed one of its principal sources of revenue. In 1836, for example, the total profits from the commercial monopolies amounted to seven hundred and fifty thousand Egyptian pounds out of a total State revenue of three million Egyptian pounds. (Crouchley, 1938: 87) The importance of these State monopolies was that they had eliminated all petty-merchants from the agrarian sector and since all commercial crops were handed over to the State, in exchange for subsistence goods, it also restricted the development of a money economy in the rural areas. The efficient enforcement of State decrees, forbidding the sale of agricultural products to anyone but agents of the State, and the use of Egyptian ships to transport the products to European ports dealt a crippling blow to all European merchants. (Owen, 1969: 25-6) That is, except for those merchants, such as the Greeks, who benefited from Muhammad 'Ali's patronage.

The signing of the Anglo-Turkish Convention in 1838 directly challenged these State monopolies, but Muhammad 'Ali was able to defy the stipulations of the treaty. (Issa, 1970; Mustafa, 1968) Nevertheless, with the Treaty of London of 1840, signed after Muhammad 'Ali's military defeat at the gates of Istanbul, the European Consuls were able to apply gradually the stipulations of the 1838 Convention. Their implications for internal commerce were of great significance. The Convention allowed European merchants to penetrate into the interior of Egypt and purchase directly from the producers, and thus contributed to the development of a money economy and the vulnerability of State-supported
merchants. (Owen, 1969: 65-7) These merchants, most of whom were Greeks, mounted a rearguard action and with the Egyptian Treasury also feeling the effects of the abolition of State monopolies, a State decree was issued in February 1854, absolutely forbidding the sale of agricultural products to anyone but government officials. (Owen, 1969: 67-8)

The decree of 1854, however, had an important implication which needs to be pointed out. In order to succeed in re-introducing State monopolies, 'Abbas Hilmi, Khedive of Egypt, had to secure the cooperation of the members of the aristocracy who owned vast estates and made large profits by selling their agricultural products to foreign merchants. Thus, it would appear that Egyptian State control over the sale of agricultural products had been replaced by an oligopolistic control composed of a few wealthy landowners. 'Abbas Hilmi was assassinated a few months later and his successor, Sa'id Pasha, abolished the decree. During Sa'id's reign, 1854 to 1863, the Convention of 1838 was implemented to its full extent. (Owen, 1969: 68)

It is with the arrival of Sa?id Pasha that this sector of the Egyptian economy experienced rapid growth and important changes. With the gradual abolition of State monopolies, direct contact between European merchants and Egyptian producers was established. This enhanced even further the monetarisation of the rural economy and, along with the increase in agricultural output, it accelerated the commercialisation of agriculture. The most significant result of this process was the rapid expansion of Egyptian foreign trade.

As Table 3.8 indicates, the volume of foreign trade increased by more than five-fold during the period 1838 to 1880, but the largest increase
took place during the last twenty years when it increased by more than threefold. It should also be noted, from Table 3.9, that exports increased at a much faster rate than imports and were much larger in absolute terms.

Table 3.9: Value of Foreign Trade, 1838 - 1880

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>VOLUME (££) (thousands)</th>
<th>INCREASE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>327.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Issawi, 1966: 363

Table 3.10: Egyptian Foreign Trade, 1841 - 1879 (Annual Averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>IMPORTS (££)</th>
<th>EXPORTS (££)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841-4</td>
<td>1,838,150</td>
<td>1,670,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845-9</td>
<td>1,631,441</td>
<td>1,836,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850-4</td>
<td>1,849,621</td>
<td>2,926,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855-9</td>
<td>2,580,164</td>
<td>3,683,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-4</td>
<td>3,520,422</td>
<td>8,623,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865-9</td>
<td>5,203,768</td>
<td>11,712,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870-3</td>
<td>6,249,978</td>
<td>11,134,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875-9</td>
<td>4,685,297</td>
<td>13,595,818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are for the port of Alexandria until 1875, after that they are for the whole of Egypt
Source: Owen, 1969: 168

From the above table it is possible to conclude that through the period 1841 to 1879 Egypt enjoyed a favourable balance of trade. Furthermore, it is clear that this positive balance of trade was substantially augmented from 1860, coinciding with the cotton boom period due to the American Civil War. Egyptian cotton fetched premium prices in the European market. In order to elaborate on the characteristics of this foreign trade, it is useful to compare cotton exports with the other major Egyptian export, cereals.
The above tables make it clear that cotton was the most important item in Egypt's export list, and indeed Egypt's favourable balance of trade was almost entirely due to this one crop. Furthermore, as the figures below indicate, the majority of Egyptian cotton was exported to one country, Britain.

Table 3.11: Major Egyptian Exports from Alexandria, 1831 - 1979 (Percentage of Total Exports by Value)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROP</th>
<th>1831</th>
<th>1836</th>
<th>1848</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1869</th>
<th>1879</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cereals</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Percentages calculated by me from values given by Owen, 1969: 166-70

Table 3.12: Exports of Egyptian Cotton, 1874 - 1879 (Percentage of Total Exports by Value)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Owen, 1969: 124

By occupying such an important position in Egypt's foreign trade, cotton played the dominant role in the development of what was essentially an
export-oriented economy. A reliance on one crop, which was in fact primarily exported to one country, however, posed a potential threat to Egypt's export earnings and the future stability of her economy. This was primarily due to the fact that Egypt had no way of influencing the price of this commodity in the British market, which continued to receive over eighty per cent of its cotton from the United States. (Owen, 1969: 417) This was quite evident at the end of the American Civil War, when cotton prices in the international market dropped sharply. The effects of the collapse of cotton prices was felt both in Britain and in Egypt. On the 9th of April, 1965, C Joyce and Company of London: East Indian and Egyptian Merchants, declared bankruptcy. The Bank of Egypt showed a loss in business of about two million sterling the following year, and the Anglo-Egyptian Bank, which had only been established the previous year, lost over two hundred thousand sterling. This financial crisis for all enterprises dealing in Egyptian cotton exports was aggravated by the fact that the London Stock Market also collapsed in May, 1866. (Owen, 1969: 119-21)

It is of interest to note, however, that the burden of the 1866 cotton crash fell predominantly on the Egyptian State and the peasant producers.

[Khedive] Ismail was persuaded [sic] by a committee of local financiers [Europeans] to assist those firms who had lent money on land, now a worthless security...According to the plan proposed and accepted, the government took over these 'village debts' as they were called, paying European creditors with bonds carrying 7 per cent interest, while arranging to collect the money from the debtors over a period of seven years at 12 per cent...The total of such debts were fixed at 17,000,000 (£680,000). As they comprised just loans made on land, they represented only a small proportion of total indebtedness. (Owen, 1969: 119-20)

European financiers seem to have been able to survive the 1866 cotton crash, but it was the the Egyptian Treasury that was burdened with its
implications. This highlighted sharply the economic and political influence of European financial interests in Egypt. It is important, therefore, to examine in some detail the activities and role of the financial sector in the transformations experienced by the Egyptian economy during this period.
As was indicated above, the Muhammad 'Ali period was characterised by the extensive State monopolies over the entire economy and especially the trade of agricultural products. Nevertheless, a few privileged merchants did manage to accumulate considerable wealth during this period due to their close relationship with Muhammad 'Ali. One of the main elements of this relationship was their ability to provide the State Treasury with large amounts of cash whenever it was needed. These loans were usually made in the form of an advance against contracts for future delivery of agricultural commodities by the State. Furthermore, when the State faced a serious financial crisis, it would pay State functionaries with teskires (treasury bonds), in lieu of a cash salary. These teskires could be discounted with the wealthy merchants for a commission of fifteen to twenty per cent, and then the merchants would receive crops from the State in exchange for the teskires which they held. (Crouchley, 1938: 105)

In order that the merchants could have large sums of cash at their disposal in order to meet the demands of Muhammad 'Ali and hence keep their privileges, close contacts were maintained with several European bankers. The most important merchant bankers during this period who combined commerce with lending money to the State were the English firm of Briggs and Company, the Greek firm of Tossitsas, and the Swiss firm of Ghebard and Company. (Crouchley, 1938: 105) It was a relationship which was noted by a number of foreign visitors to Egypt. Writing in 1840, Bowring, pointed out that

A few years ago, it was the habit of the Government to arrange for delivery of produce a long time before it was ready for shipment and to obtain from merchants big advances on account. This is no longer necessary. I understand from the ministers of the Pasha that they find no difficulty in raising considerable sums of temporary loans at a very moderate rate of
interest. In fact, Alexandria is now the seat of many commercial houses, who, by themselves or by their connections, are quite competent to make advances to the Egyptian Government, and who, at the same time, are quite ready to do so. (Bowring, 1840, quoted in Crouchley, 1936: 7-8)

Clearly the role of these merchant bankers was quite significant in that outside the State they had a virtual monopoly over commercial and financial activities in Egypt. Nevertheless, and in distinct contrast to the second half of the nineteenth century, they were not in a position to control economic affairs in Egypt. These State borrowing activities during the Muhammad 'Ali period did not lead to any substantial public debt.

Egypt has no national debt of any sort. Neither do the present, nor will the future population bear any of the responsibilities of the past. No pecuniary charge upon time to come has been left by the follies or the necessities of time gone by; the generations are born released from any claims emanating from preceding generations. If they reap from the savings of the forefathers, they have no encumbrance from their extravagances. (Bowring, 1840, quoted in Crouchley, 1936: 12)

Bowring's words were almost prophetic of what was about to happen to the Egyptian economy and society. Within thirty years the entire Egyptian State was declared bankrupt and Egypt was subsequently invaded by British troops, ostensibly to safeguard the interests of the European bondholders. Nevertheless, up to the end of the Muhammad 'Ali period, 1848, European merchant bankers were kept under strict control by the Egyptian State. After that date, and with the commercialisation of agriculture and the implementation of the Anglo-Turkish Convention of 1838, these European merchant bankers expanded their activities and escaped from Egyptian State control. In effect, these merchant bankers can be divided into two separate sectors, although they were closely interrelated: first, the petty-merchants in the villages who were also usurers; and second, the large merchant bankers in Alexandria.
One of the first changes to be experienced by the Egyptian economy after 1848 was the widespread penetration of the Egyptian rural structures by many Europeans, mostly Greeks, who combined petty-trading with money lending. Along with some indigenous merchants, these Greeks soon had a considerable proportion of the Egyptian peasants indebted to them and a virtual monopoly over rural money-lending activities. (Crouchley, 1936: 28) The role of these petty-merchants/usurers has already been discussed in a previous chapter, but it is necessary to point out here that it was quite central in facilitating the extensive cultivation of cotton and its transportation to Alexandria for shipping to Europe. Inevitably, the more these petty-merchants/usurers extended their activities, the more cotton was cultivated and the peasantry became indebted, while the merchant bankers in Alexandria increased their wealth and power. This is not simply because they organised the export and sale of Egyptian cotton, but also because they financed practically all the activities of the petty-merchants/usurers.

During the 1850s, therefore, banking and other financial activities flourished in Alexandria, and by 1877, there were eight fully developed commercial banks providing telegraphic exchange on the Paris and London financial markets. (Issawi, 1966: 364) The first such bank was the Bank of Egypt, established by a Greek financier named Paschalis. As with the period of Muhammad 'Ali, these merchant banks carried out a substantial part of their business with the Egyptian State. Their State-related affairs consisted of the following: first, they lent money to the ruler of Egypt and the Egyptian Treasury for public expenditure such as public works; second, they handled the transfer to London of the part of the Egyptian tribute to the Ottoman Sultan which was mortgaged to Britain; and third, they dealt in government bonds. (Owen, 1969: 84) It was the
third item of their activities which was eventually to become their primary activity as State expenditure rose disproportionately to State revenue during the 1860s and early 1870s. Two additional types of bonds were added to their activities, "...the so-called bon d'appointements paid to government officials in lieu of salary and mainly sold by them at a discount to merchants and brokers...and those created after 1860 to pay for the purchase of Suez Canal shares". (Owen, 1969: 84)

One of the influential banks to be established during this period was the Anglo-Egyptian bank in 1864. It was established by the Frenchman, J Pastré, the Greek, Ioannis Sinadinos, and Hambro of London. It appeared on the London market in July, 1864, with a nominal capital of two million sterling under the auspices of two British firms, Agra and Masterman's Bank and General Credit and Finance Company. Within one year of its establishment, it had made a profit of seventy thousand sterling or sixteen per cent of its paid up capital. (Owen, 1969: 114)

Within a short period of time this bank became one of the primary channels "...through which large blocks of shares of the Khedive's later loans were passed into French hands acting particularly as purchasing agent for the Crédit Foncier de France". (Crouchley, 1936: 30) As to the reason why the bank was registered in London, although it was controlled by French capital at that time, has to do with the fact that banking laws were more liberal in Britain.

It was Sinadinos, however, who represented the interests of British capital, and who ensured that French capital eventually declined and British capital took over the bank. In 1872, the Anglo-Egyptian Bank established the Bank of Alexandria, which was also registered in London, in which more than half of the subscribed capital came from Greek financiers who resided in Alexandria and were friends of Sinadinos.
As with the other banks, this one also specialised in loans to the State. It was the most lucrative activity for all the banks, and it permitted them to emerge as the dominant factor both in the economy of Alexandria and Egypt as a whole by the end of the 1860s. They were able to determine the nature and direction of commerce and foreign trade as well as the type of public works that took place. (Issa, 1970: 40)

An important characteristic of these banking and financial activities was the concentration of power and wealth in the hands of just a few bankers. In the late 1860s, the Frenchmen Edward Dervieu, the British Henry Oppenheimer and the Greek Ioannis Sinadinos in effect controlled the whole of the banking and financial structure in Egypt. As such, they also extended their control over other sectors of the economy. In 1863, for example, Henry Oppenheimer and Edward Dervieu established the Egyptian Commercial and Trading Company whose primary function was to carry out trade in Upper Egypt. (Issa, 1970: 43; Owen, 1969: 114) Nevertheless, as with the banks, the primary source of profit for this company was the lending of money to cotton cultivators and the arranging of loans for the State. (Issa, 1970: 43; Owen, 1969: 115) Encouraged by the success of their first company, the same two financiers established the Medjidiyah Steam Navigation Company in 1864, with a capital of two million Egyptian pounds. Its shareholders were almost entirely Egyptian landlords and the Egyptian State, although in effect it was administered by European finance capitalists. (Owen, 1969: 114) This example highlights another important characteristic of the banking and finance sector. In several cases the bulk of the capital was raised in Egypt and especially from the Egyptian State, while control and administration was almost exclusively in the hands of European finance capital.
The Egyptian State was quite aware of the increasing influence and power of these few European bankers and financiers, but at the same time the grandiose development projects it had embarked upon required financing. The attempt by an Austrian financier, Antoine Lucovitch, to establish in 1863 the Société Agricole et Industrielle d'Égypte, is a good example of the contradictory situation that confronted the State. The primary objective of this company was the improvement of irrigation works and machinery in the Delta through the importation of water pumps which they would continue to own and control. The capital for this operation was to be provided by Oppenheim and Dervieu. (Issa, 1970: 43; Owen, 1969: 115-6) Irrigation, however, was still a State monopoly which was crucial in permitting the State to maintain some degree of control over the agrarian sector which still provided it with the bulk of its revenue. This was in addition to the fact that Khedive Isma'il was the leading importer and distributor of water pumps and other irrigation equipment.

On the 11th of July, 1863, however, one week before the establishment of the company, a State decree was issued which required all water pumps and other irrigation equipment to receive a licence from State appointed irrigation engineers before they could be used. Lucovitch lost interest and at the time the company was not established. Nevertheless, in April, 1865, the company was founded by Dervieu and Oppenheim, after they had agreed to avoid any direct involvement in the agricultural sector and instead to concentrate on government initiated public works and to deal in real estate. (Owen, 1969: 116) Thus, this company followed in the path of all the other financial enterprises: it arranged loans in order to facilitate large State expenditures in public works. The Egyptian State may have been concerned with the increasing power of
these financiers, but it also relied heavily upon them and could not prevent them expanding their activities in the sphere of State loans.

The profitability of this particular activity within the banking and finance sector can be seen from the fact that even after Egypt's finances were publicly declared to be in serious trouble in 1876, the following year seven small banks were established in Alexandria with a joint capital of six million sterling. (Owen, 1969: 157)

Furthermore, it should be noted that all the capital for these seven small banks was raised in Alexandria from European bankers, financiers and merchants who wished to take advantage of the extensive State initiated public works schemes. Nevertheless, all seven banks were in fact registered in Europe and thus considered to be foreign financial enterprises. This pattern of activity which characterised the banking and finance sector, especially in the 1870s, raises two important issues. First, after the end of the American Civil War, and the collapse of Egyptian cotton prices in the European market, the many Europeans who had accumulated large fortunes during the cotton boom period were seeking profitable outlets for their capital. The cotton trade no longer provided large and quick profits so they focussed on the only secure alternative, State loans. Second, the fact that all these banks and financial enterprises were either registered in Europe or controlled by European capital also implied that the interest payments on the extensive State loans was being transferred out of Egypt. In 1877, for example, when the Egyptian State debt amounted to almost one hundred million sterling, "...£ 4,961,000 was remitted through the local banks to Paris and London in payment of interest on this debt, [which] indicates clearly where the debt was held". (Crouchley, 1936: 30)
The banking and finance sector of the Egyptian economy experienced important changes during this period. In the 1830s and 1840s, a few privileged European merchants operated also as bankers, but in the role of a junior partner to the Egyptian State which maintained monopolistic control over the Egyptian economy. By the late 1870s, however, a small group of European bankers and financiers had managed to extend their oligarchic control of the banking and finance sector over most of the other economic sectors of the Egyptian economy. This they had accomplished through their virtual control of the Egyptian State itself, due to the extensive borrowing of the latter from the former. The prominence and power of this oligarchic group of European bankers and financiers had serious implications for the entire economy and society, and in particular for the other non-agricultural sectors. It is important, therefore, to examine briefly its implications on the manufacturing and internal retail sector.
5. Retail and Manufacturing

The increasing vulnerability of this sector during this period can be observed from the fact that whereas there were one hundred and sixty-four crafts in the city of Cairo in 1844, by 1877, there were only forty-four left. As to the Egyptian retail trade, this was practically liquidated when the last Egyptian commercial house, 'Umar Affandi, was bought by a European firm, Orosdi Bach, in the early 1880s. (Issa, 1970: 53-4) In some respects the dramatic decline of this sector, along with developments in the other sectors of the economy, highlighted the fact that during this period Egyptian society witnessed the replacement of its own commercial and manufacturing bourgeoisie with a European financial bourgeoisie. The socio-economic and political implications were to condition the dynamics of the rest of Egypt's modern history.

This is in distinct contrast to the rapid development experienced by this sector during the Muhammad 'Ali period. As early as 1816, Muhammad 'Ali decreed that all manufacturing was a State monopoly and embarked on an extensive programme of rapid industrialisation. This programme was similar to the putting-out system where the State played the role of the merchant, providing all the raw materials and purchasing all the finished commodities for sale in the Egyptian and European markets. Needless to add, the most important development in this State controlled activity was the manufacture of cloth and other cotton products. More than a quarter of all cotton cultivated was used by these cloth manufacturers and by "...1837 50,000 kantars of yarn were being produced in twenty-nine factories in Upper and Lower Egypt. For ten years or more, Egyptian factories provided the country with the greater part of..."
its requirements of the cheaper kinds of cotton cloth". (Crouchley, 1938: 69)

By 1838, the equivalent of over twelve million sterling had been invested in the manufacturing sector and the cloth manufacturers alone employed thirty thousand workers in 1833, which amounted to one per cent of the total Egyptian population in that year. (Issawi, 1966: 362; Owen, 1969: 45) The dockyards employed about five thousand workers and the other small manufacturers employed between them an additional five thousand workers. (Crouchley, 1938: 73; Issawi, 1966: 362) By the end of the 1830s, therefore, Egypt's manufacturing sector employed approximately forty thousand workers, most of them in the cloth industry. This provided a boost for Egyptian retail trade and it was then that commercial houses such as 'Umar Affandi were established. Nevertheless, after the Treaty of London in 1840, which restricted the State monopolies by encouraging the application of the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Convention, this sector experienced a dramatic decline. "...By April 1845 [Muhammad 'Ali] was willing to admit to Hekekyan that his industrial policy had failed". (Owen, 1969: 83)

It was during the reign of Khedive Isma'il, and at the height of the cotton boom period, that this sector witnessed a small revival. The two most important sectors that flourished were the sugar industry and cotton-ginning. During the period 1863 to 1879, sixty-four sugar factories were established, of which twenty-two were owned by Khedive Isma'il himself, and they had a combined capacity of three and one third million kantars. This was only a short-lived industrial development because by 1880 practically none of these factories were still in operation, due to the competition from high quality sugar that was being imported. (Crouchley, 1938: 117 & 135; Owen, 1969: 153-4) Cotton-
ginning, however, which was introduced in the 1850s, flourished during this whole period and continued to do so for the rest of the century. By 1863, almost one third of all the cotton produced in Egypt was ginned in steam-ginning factories of which there were at least eighty in that year. (Owen, 1969: 136) This branch of the industrial sector was initiated by Greeks and controlled almost exclusively by Greeks during this period. A few of the cotton-ginners also initiated some manufactures that used the cotton-seed by the end of the 1870s, but it was not until the twentieth century that this branch of manufacturing was able to develop. In general, however, it is possible to conclude that by the end of the 1870s, this sector, except for the cotton-ginning branch, was characterised by stagnation.

An important socio-cultural and demographic implication of the changes experienced by the various sectors of the economy was the shift of economic power from Cairo to Alexandria. Prior to 1860, Cairo was still the leading commercial centre and most agricultural products, even those produced in the Delta, were shipped there and then to Alexandria for export. With the improvement of internal transportation in the Delta and the coming of the cotton boom, the commercial centre shifted to Alexandria and with it all the merchants and financiers. After 1860, therefore, Cairo remained as an administrative centre while economic power resided in Alexandria. This reflected in some ways an important structural transformation experienced by Egyptian society during this period. Nominal administrative and political power was still exercised by Egyptians, but economic power which was in a position to manipulate political decision was almost exclusively controlled by Europeans.
Alexandria had emerged as a European commercial centre even during the period of Muhammad 'Ali. Unable to exclude Europeans from the country completely because of the Capitulations, Muhammad 'Ali had restricted their movement by prohibiting them from leaving Alexandria. After Muhammad 'Ali, however, and the changes experienced by the Egyptian economy, Alexandria emerged as the new economic centre. By 1857, the city was already prosperous and the value of urban property increased substantially, as much as two thousand per cent in a five year period. Rents increased by over five hundred per cent in the late 1850s and early 1860s and half the property in Alexandria at that time was owned by Europeans. This transformed the patterns of consumption and living in that city and by the end of the 1860s it was practically a European city. It was a city whose prosperity increased substantially every day during the cotton boom period. The British Consul-General, Colquhoun, who resided in Alexandria along with all the other European Consuls, wrote in 1863, that

*Our daily household expenses have doubled in a year...the enormous fortunes realized during the past two years have caused money to be abundant, and the merchants have adopted a style of luxury and extravagance that enable them to command the daily market and have forced up the price of articles of daily necessity to a ruinous height.* (quoted in Owen, 1969: 426)

It was European merchants, landlords, craftsmen, etc. who benefited from the transformation of Alexandria into both a prosperous city and the centre of economic power in the 1860s and 1870s. It is not surprising, therefore, that large numbers of Europeans arrived in Egypt during these two decades in order to take advantage of the new prosperity. By 1857, Europeans were arriving in Alexandria at a rate of thirty thousand per year. (Crouchley, 1938: 256) A large number of those arriving were Greeks. Of the Europeans who arrived in Alexandria between February and
August, 1864, the four largest groups were the Greeks (1,875), the British (1,650), the French (1,187) and the Austrians (1,061). (Owen, 1969: 113) Given that many of the Greeks who arrived also held passports from other European countries, it is possible to conclude that the Greek arrivals exceeded all other arrivals. The implication was that the European population increased at a much faster rate than that of the Egyptian population as a whole, and most of these Europeans settled in Alexandria. This, of course, allowed Alexandria's demography to increase at a much faster rate than Cairo.

**Table 3.14: Foreign Citizens in Egypt, 1836 - 1882**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>79,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>90,886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crouchley, 1938: 256

**Table 3.15: Population Increases in Cairo and Alexandria, 1800 - 1882**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CAIRO</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ALEXANDRIA</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>143,134</td>
<td>138.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>349,883</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>374,838</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>231,306</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In many respects Alexandria became a European city which was beyond the administrative and political control of the Egyptian State. The Europeans in that city were in effect governed, if they were, by the seventeen European Consulates, and their economic enterprises were invariably registered in either Paris or London. By the end of the period under consideration in this section, Egypt was de facto controlled by a European bourgeois enclave that was based in Alexandria.
It was in such a context that the deteriorating financial situation of the Egyptian economy led to the events of 1882 and the British military occupation of the entire country. Thus, with British military support after 1882, the Alexandria European bourgeoisie was able to implement de jure control of Egyptian society. The events of 1882 have already been discussed in chapter two and three and do not need to be repeated here.

The next section, therefore, will examine developments and changes experienced by the Egyptian economy after the de jure implementation of European (British) control.
II. The Formation of a Colonial Economy, 1882 - 1900

Extensive State borrowing, for the purpose of accomplishing major public works such as the Suez Canal, constituted one of the particular characteristics of the Egyptian economy during the 1860s and 1870s. This encouraged the emergence of major socio-political contradictions within Egyptian society which led to the Law of Liquidation in 1880 and the abdication of Khedive Isma'il. The immediate effect of this law, and the abdication of Isma'il, was that two decades of large-scale borrowing on government account came to a sudden halt and Egypt was unable to raise any funds in the European money markets. (Crouchley, 1938: 145) In some respects 1880 also represents the last stage in the development of internal socio-political contradictions which since 1876 were characterised

...by a growing revolt against foreign oppression, in which the Egyptian army, the only native institution now surviving within the State machine, was a leading force...On September 9th, 1881, the Khedive Tewfik, who had been put into office as the tool of foreign interests, was forced to capitulate on all points, and a new, avowedly anti-Imperialist, Ministry took power, with the support of the military groups led by Arabi. Thus a revolution was carried through. (Burns, 1928: 9-10)

The arrival of 'Urabi at the helm of the Egyptian State, and his decision to suspend the payment of interest on the State loans, challenged both the economic interests and political power of the European bond-holders in Egypt. This was particularly the case with regards to British finance capital and its agents in Alexandria. Thus, on the 11th of July, 1882, British gunboats bombarded Alexandria and so a stage in Egypt's modern economic and political history came to an end. Although the safety of Europeans in Alexandria was the ostensible reason for landing British troops in that city, they immediately engaged the Egyptian army, suppressed the 'Urabi Revolution, installed a British
garrison in Cairo and appointed British advisers to the Khedive and all his ministers. (Barbour, 1972: 53) Having secured the Egyptian military and political spheres, the British turned their attention to the economy and it was then that it became abundantly clear that "...the raison d'etre of British rule was to restore order [sic] to Egypt's finances and to give priority to the payment of interest and the amortization of the national debt". (O'Brien, 1966: 45)

Appropriately, it was Sir Evelyn Baring (later Lord Cromer) of the London financiers Baring Brothers, who took on the responsibility of organising Egyptian finances and ensuring that the interest on the State loans was paid regularly. Sir Evelyn Baring was appointed British Consul-General in 1882, and for the next twenty-five years he effectively ruled Egypt on behalf of the British crown. (Burns, 1928: 13) The task confronting him was not easy, for "...in 1880, Egypt's public debt was estimated at £98.4 million, and increased to £116.6 million in the next twenty years". (Radwan, 1974: 234) Furthermore, the annual payment of tribute and interest on the debt was nearly £5,000,000. The total revenue of the government was about £10,000,000 per annum. Exports represented about an equal sum. The fixed payment of interest and tribute therefore absorbed half of the revenue and nearly half the exports of the country. (Crouchley, 1938: 145)

Trying to balance Egyptian finances and also meet the debt and tribute obligations forced Sir Evelyn to restructure the Egyptian economy during his twenty-five year tenure as British Consul-General. Thus, it may be suggested that during this period of Egypt's modern history the characteristics of a colonised society were predominant and the specific policies of Sir Evelyn determined the development of all socio-economic and political structures. These policies and their effects will be discussed in some detail below.
1. Agriculture

When Sir Evelyn embarked on his task of reorganising Egypt's finances, he was confronted by the fact that an increase in taxation was out of the question. During the previous two decades taxation had increased to such levels that "...in 1880, the country, as one observer of the day said, was bled dry". (Crouchley, 1938: 146) The only alternative left for Sir Evelyn, therefore, was to emphasise "...retrenchment on all items of expenditure except investments which clearly benefited public revenue". (O'Brien, 1966: 45) Given that Egypt was essentially an agrarian society and cotton was its principal commercial crop, it is not surprising that Sir Evelyn concentrated his efforts in this sector of the Egyptian economy. As it was indicated in the previous section, irrigation works constituted the main investment in the agrarian sector and it is in this sphere that he also placed most of his efforts.

a. The development of irrigation works

It is interesting to note the manner in which Sir Evelyn argued for the investment of limited resources in the sphere of irrigation works. First, he noted that it would increase State revenue since irrigation works were the responsibility of the government while landlords were obliged to pay for all such investments through an increase of their land tax. Second, he was convinced that an important source of state revenue would come from the "...duties upon additional imports which, as Lord Cromer repeatedly argued, inevitably followed the expansion of cultivable land and cotton exports". (Crouchley, 1938: 146) Thus, it is possible to suggest that Lord Cromer did in fact attempt to increase taxation, but he placed the burden on the landlords and the middle classes who were the main consumers of imports. It was a policy,
however, which antagonised many of the Egyptian landlords and urban Alexandrian middle classes, including the Alexandrian Greeks, and contributed to the development of new socio-political contradictions that expressed themselves in the nationalist revolution of 1919. Nevertheless, Lord Cromer implemented his policies almost immediately, and

...to this end, when, in 1885, a loan was contracted to enable Egypt to pay off the indemnities arising out of the Alexandria riots, [British bombardment of the city], and other expenses, a sum of £2,000,000 was added, to be spent on improving the irrigation system of the country. Expert irrigation engineers were brought from India to supervise the irrigation works and to see that the money was spent to the best advantage. By 1891, £1,800,000 had been spent upon improvements in irrigation. Slowly the work of the engineers began to show its fruits in increased production. (Crouchley, 1938: 146)

The first major irrigation project to be undertaken was the renovation and extension of the Delta barrage, near Cairo, which had been initially constructed by Muhammad 'Ali. The British irrigation engineers from India argued that "...at a single stroke this would obviate the waste of the annual corvée for deepening the canals; save time and money lost in raising the water to the fields in summer; extend the cultivated area, and increase agricultural production". (Crouchley, 1938: 147) The repair work was completed in 1891, and its effects in the agrarian sector were felt almost immediately. Areas which had never seen summer water, and thus could not cultivate cotton, were provided with an abundant supply. Furthermore, there was an extension of the total cultivated area in the Delta region and, of course, an enormous increase in the cultivation of summer crops, especially cotton. In fact, cotton production almost doubled in about three years, from 2.7 million kantars in 1888 to 5.2 million kantars in 1892. (Crouchley, 1938: 148)
Nevertheless, as Patrick O'Brien has shown, the growth experienced by Egyptian agriculture in general was much less spectacular than during the period preceding 1882.

Table 3.16: Indices of Agrarian Growth, 1872 - 1899

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL OUTPUT</th>
<th>TOTAL AREA</th>
<th>CULTIVATED POPULATION</th>
<th>CROPPED AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872-8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-9</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PER CAPITA OUTPUT</th>
<th>OUTPUT PER UNIT OF CROPPED LAND</th>
<th>OUTPUT PER UNIT OF CULTIVATED LAND</th>
<th>CROPPED AREA PER CAPITA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872-8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: O'Brien, 1966: 185

An important factor which inhibited the rapid growth of the agrarian sector was the increase of rural population by rates that exceeded those of the pre-1882 period. In fact, the overall prosperity witnessed by Egypt and its rural sector in the period 1830 to 1880 meant that child mortality dropped, while at the same time child birth rates remained high. Thus, in the post-1882 period, the rural population grew at a much faster rate than the extension of cultivated land through the improvements of irrigation works. This, however, did not imply a decrease in the value of agrarian production. On the contrary, it appears that the irrigation works carried out during this period contributed to an increase of value, albeit smaller than what had occurred in the decades prior to 1882. Nevertheless, as Table 3.17 shows, this increase in value came almost entirely from one crop, cotton. This is in distinct contrast to the earlier period when all crops contributed to the increase of both physical output and value.
Table 3.17: Estimated Value of Agricultural Production, 1886 - 1899

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROP</th>
<th>1886-7 (EE.000)</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
<th>1895-9 (EE.000)</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>4,186</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>7,999</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>11,064</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton-seed</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>16,240</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21,331</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Owen, 1969: 262

The above table indicates that the total value of the commodities listed increased by over thirty per cent during the period 1886 to 1899. It was cotton, however, which primarily contributed to this increase as the other crops either remained stationary or declined in their contribution. The same can be observed for the area occupied by different crops during this period.

Table 3.18: Acreage of Different Crops, 1879 - 1899

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROP</th>
<th>1879 AREA</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
<th>1899 AREA</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>495,707</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1,153,307</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>890,699</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>1,241,052</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>616,377</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>637,752</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>490,565</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>536,416</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crouchley, 1938: 164

It is clear that although cotton did not occupy the largest area of cultivated land, it was the one crop which in fact increased its proportion during this period. In fact, all the other crops experienced significant decreases in their respective proportion of cultivated area. As with the earlier period, therefore, it is possible to conclude that the major benefit from the irrigation works was that the cultivation of cotton was extended at the expense of the other major crops. Thus, Egypt's direction towards monoculture was accentuated even further. Furthermore, as cotton was a valuable commercial crop, the large landowners were very keen to cultivate it and hence continued to
purchase even larger areas of land in order to cultivate this one crop. The irrigation works, therefore, did not only intensify Egypt's monoculture and inhibit, albeit inadvertently, the growth of other crops, but they also contributed to the consolidation of the process of uneven distribution of land which had been initiated in the 1870s.

b. Land ownership, 1882–1900

Legislation permitting the private ownership of land did not emerge in Egypt until 1858, and during the next decade less than one seventh of all agricultural land was transferred to private ownership. (Baer, 1966: 83-5) Private landownership was extended further during the 1860s and it was in the 1870s that land could be said to have become a commodity and thus permitted the development of a land market. This encouraged the development of European land companies and the start of the uneven distribution of land. (Baer, 1966: 84-90) In 1884, a report by Lord Cromer indicates that land-tax was levied from the first three of the following four categories into which land ownership was divided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europeans</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notables &amp; Officials</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villagers</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Domains</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Owen, 1969: 239

This inequality was accentuated further so that by "...1894 the government figures showed that 42.5 per cent of the land in private ownership was held in estates of fifty feddans and above...Medium size properties (five to fifty feddans) occupied another 37.7 per cent, while those of five feddans and under accounted for the remaining 19.8 per
cent". (Owen, 1969: 239) The inequality in land distribution continued to increase as the rural population continued to grow.

Table 3.20: Distribution of Land Ownership in 1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF PROPERTY</th>
<th>OWNERS (000's)</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL LANDOWNERS</th>
<th>AREA (000's)</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL LAND</th>
<th>AVERAGE SIZE OF OWNERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 50</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,244</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>187.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Abdel-Fadil, 1975: 6

By the end of the nineteenth century, therefore, Egypt had a highly developed system of commercial agricultural production which relied almost exclusively on one crop, cotton, and a very unequal distribution of land ownership. The large landlords, who in fact constituted the majority of those who owned agricultural land, tended to concentrate on the cultivation of this one commercial crop and thus contributed significantly to increasing Egypt's exports.
2. Foreign Trade

As cotton was a commercial crop intended primarily for export, its increased output necessitated further improvements and extensions in the Egyptian internal transportation system. As Lord Cromer had suggested, this provided an important market for British industrial products. In fact this was confirmed by a British financial advisor who noted that

*When once the policy of developing the country's resources by means of irrigation was adopted, heavy capital expenditure on a number of other objects became an indirect but inevitable consequence. The constantly increasing areas under cultivation entail fresh railway lines and more rolling stock to carry the cotton and other produce; the growing exports and imports require more harbour accommodation. (quoted in Burns, 1928: 17)*

Thus, the above factors determined the pattern of foreign trade during this period. Cotton and cotton-seed occupied a prominent position in the export sphere and capital goods constituted the most important items in the import sphere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>COTTON (£000)</th>
<th>COTTON-SEED (£000)</th>
<th>TOTAL (£000)</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPORTS (£000)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880-4</td>
<td>8,766</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>10,241</td>
<td>13,673</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-9</td>
<td>8,387</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>9,894</td>
<td>12,270</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-4</td>
<td>9,512</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>11,322</td>
<td>14,348</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-9</td>
<td>10,759</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>12,338</td>
<td>14,787</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Owen, 1969: 198 & 306

It is clear from the above table that cotton and cotton-seed exports constituted the bulk of Egyptian exports and thus contributed to the increase experienced by this sector during this period. It should be noted, however, that the irrigation works had contributed to an increase of over one hundred per cent in the production of cotton, from 2,791,000 kantars in 1880-4 to 5,765,000 kantars in 1895-9. (Owen, 1969: 198)

Thus, it is possible to conclude that the investments in irrigation and
the concomitant increase in physical output from this one crop were not reflected equally in the value generated by the export sector. The main reason for this was that European prices for Egyptian cotton dropped at the same time that Egyptian cotton exports were increasing. This was especially the case in Britain which received the bulk of the Egyptian cotton being exported. For example, immediately after the completion of the Delta barrage and the substantial increase in cotton production, its price collapsed in the Liverpool market. In 1889, its price had been 7.44 d/lb while in 1898 it decreased to a low 4.44 d/lb or a decrease of over forty per cent. (Owen, 1969: 203) During the same period the Lancashire textile mills took almost fifty per cent of all Egyptian cotton exports. In 1890-4 they took fifty four per cent and in 1895-9 they took forty nine per cent. (Owen, 1969: 198)

During the same period Egyptian imports consisted primarily of four categories: "...manufactured goods; industrial raw materials, such as coal, petrol, and building wood; raw materials for working-up in Egypt, such as tobacco; and food". (Owen, 1969: 308) All these categories increased substantially, especially the last two. As Roger Owen points out, this was not simply due to the decline in domestic production of food stuffs, "...but rather to two other factors, the growth in population and rising living standards, which caused many families to purchase imported flour of a higher quality than that produced in Egypt". (Owen, 1969: 309) It is not made clear in Owen's argument, but undoubtedly the families which consumed European flour consisted of the Egyptian landed classes and the several thousand Europeans. Once more Lord Cromer's prediction that investments in irrigation works would contribute to an increase in State revenues from the duties imposed on imports was shown to be accurate.
It is interesting at this point to note that the increase in the third category mentioned above revolved around the import of tobacco and short-staple cotton. Both these items had been grown in Egypt in the period prior to 1882. Lord Cromer, however, prohibited the cultivation of tobacco, despite the fact that the beginnings of a cigarette industry had already been developed in Alexandria by Greeks coming from Istanbul. Furthermore, Egyptian landlords preferred to cultivate long-staple cotton which fetched a premium on the European markets, but it was too expensive for village weavers. Thus, the decline of its cultivation encouraged its import since it was the basic material used for cloth-making by most Egyptians in the rural sector. Thus, it is also possible to conclude that it was consumption imports which increased and that to some extent this was the result of Lord Cromer's policies which focussed on means of increasing State revenue in order to pay the interest on Egypt's loans.

Despite the nature and characteristics of Egyptian foreign trade during this period, what needs to be emphasised is that there was a substantial positive balance of trade.

**Table 3.22: Egyptian Foreign Trade, 1880 – 1899**

(Annual averages in £,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>IMPORTS</th>
<th>% INCREASE</th>
<th>EXPORTS</th>
<th>% INCREASE</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880-4</td>
<td>7,384</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,673</td>
<td></td>
<td>+6,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885-9</td>
<td>7,947</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12,270</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>+4,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890-4</td>
<td>8,872</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14,348</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>+5,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895-9</td>
<td>10,249</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>14,787</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>+4,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Owen, 1969: 306

This positive balance of trade persisted during the two decades even though the above table indicates that imports increased on the whole at
a faster rate than imports. Nevertheless, the entire positive balance was taken up by the payments on the interest of Egypt's loans.

Table 3.23: Balance of Trade and Interest Payments, 1884 - 1897
(Annual averages in £,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INTEREST</th>
<th>TRADE BALANCE</th>
<th>NET BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884-92</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>- 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-97</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>4,162</td>
<td>- 1,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Radwan, 1974: 235

Despite the efforts of the British Consul-General, therefore, the Egyptian economy grew more dependent on the export of one single agricultural commodity and suffered from a serious and increasing negative balance of payments during these two decades. The payment of interest on the loans was prompt and accurate, however, and this encouraged foreign capital to come to the assistance of Egypt's troubled finances. In effect, given Lord Cromer's policy of restricting public expenditure, and the negative balance of payments, foreign capital became the only source for most development projects, except irrigation works.
3. Banking and Finance

During this period there was a substantial increase in the investment of private capital in a number of Egyptian companies and especially those that concentrated on transactions in agricultural land. Much of this capital was raised in the European money markets, but a considerable sum was also raised locally. The bulk of these private investments, however, took place in the 1890s. This was primarily due to the fact that the events during the period 1876 to 1882 had scared many European financiers. Thus, it took a number of years and Lord Cromer's stringent economic policies before European financiers risked embarking on financial activities in Egypt. In fact, during the decade 1880 to 1890

...a number of companies were forced into liquidation; others only narrowly escaped. In this context it is significant that the Alexandria Ramleh Railway Co. was saved from bankruptcy by the intervention of two wealthy merchants, Zervoudachis and Salvagos. As often happened, income derived from cotton was relatively unaffected by the crisis and could be used to support enterprises in other sectors of the economy. The two mortgage companies also experienced considerable difficulty at this period. Annuities went unpaid, expropriation proceedings had often to be undertaken at great expense, and land taken over had to be farmed by the companies themselves when no purchasers could be found. (Owen, 1969: 279)

Thus, it is not surprising that during this decade the only companies that survived were those that concentrated on the ginning and pressing of cotton and those that were involved in the reconstruction of the city of Alexandria after the British bombardment of 1882. The situation changed drastically, however, after 1890. This was due to the rapid increase of land values and the general feeling that the British military presence, which by then was well established, would protect private capitalist ventures.
Table 3.24: Paid-up Capital and Debentures of Companies, 1883 - 1897
(Percentages of Total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANIES</th>
<th>1883</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>1897</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks &amp; Financial</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural &amp; Urban Land</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Canal</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial, Mining &amp; Commercial</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crouchley, 1936: 147

It is clear from the above table that the mortgage companies represented the most important sector into which private capital was invested. This is despite the fact that the table also suggests that it was also this branch of the sector which, after banking and finance, experienced the least development. In fact, it was these two branches that exemplified a substantial decrease during the two decades concerned.

Another important characteristic of this sector was that the majority of the securities were held in Europe. Thus, it is possible to suggest that practically the entire sector was controlled by Europeans.

Table 3.25: Percentage of Securities Held Abroad, 1882 - 1897

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SHARE</th>
<th>DEBENTURE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crouchley, 1936: 149

An other characteristic that emerges from the table below was the tendency for debentures to be held in Europe, while the actual shares held in Egypt were relatively higher. This confirms that the amount of capital invested from Europe increased, but it also confirms that the amount of interest and dividends that was transferred abroad also increased.
Table 3.26: Capital Inflows, Interest and Dividends Paid, 1883 - 1897 (Annual Averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
<th>INTEREST &amp; DIVIDENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1883-1892</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-1897</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Radwan, 1974: 236

It is now possible to calculate the exact balance of payments situation of the Egyptian economy during these two decades.

Table 3.27: Net Balance of Payments, 1884 - 1897 (Annual Averages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INTEREST ON DEBT</th>
<th>BALANCE OF TRADE</th>
<th>NET CAPITAL INFLOW</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884-1897</td>
<td>- 4,841</td>
<td>+ 4,422</td>
<td>- 265</td>
<td>- 684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893-1897</td>
<td>- 5,430</td>
<td>+ 4,162</td>
<td>+ 678</td>
<td>- 590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Calculated from previous tables presented above.

From the above discussion it may be concluded that the British Consul-General and his economic advisors were unable to fulfil their primary and ostensible raison d'etre in Egypt; to restore order to her financial structures. In fact, they followed an economic policy which perpetuated and reinforced certain features that may be described as typical of a dependent export economy. This is due to the fact that their policy of encouraging foreign investments accentuated the payments of interest abroad which ultimately consumed all of Egypt's positive balance of payments. Furthermore, this foreign capital concentrated solely on the export sector and its supporting sectors of the economy, and as it was practically the sole source of capital for investments, it ensured that the Egyptian economy developed along a particular framework, export orientation. The development of such an orientation was further encouraged by Lord Cromer's attitude towards industrialisation in Egypt.
4. Industry

In general, Lord Cromer had a very negative attitude towards any form of industrialisation in Egypt. It was an attitude and conviction that was even applied when "...in the 1890s groups of English entrepreneurs tried to establish textile factories in Egypt". (Radwan, 1974: 173) The background to his negative attitude towards Egyptian industrialisation is clearly stated in a letter he sent to Lord Salisbury in 1899 in which he stated that

...there can be no sort of reason why the Government should oppose any proposal which involves placing the home-made on precisely the same footing as the imported goods. On the other hand, it would, for obvious reasons, be detrimental to both English and Egyptian [sic] interests to afford any encouragement to the growth of a protected cotton industry. (quoted in Radwan, 1974: 174)

Clearly Lord Cromer spoke on behalf of the Lancashire textile owners and defended their interests rather than contributing to the development of an economic policy which would permit Egypt to make maximum use of its most important raw material. Lord Cromer's policy, however, also had the support of the Egyptian landowners who had emerged as a significant socio-political force in the period after 1882. As Samir Radwan points out, this agrarian bourgeoisie occupied

...a privileged position at the top of the social hierarchy, and enabled them to dominate the country's political institutions so that...successive governments made sure that their economic policies were primarily designed to protect and promote these 'real interests'. (Radwan, 1974: 241)

The Egyptian agrarian bourgeoisie consolidated its power during these two decades under the economic and political policies of Lord Cromer, and controlled a disproportionately large percentage of the agricultural area in Egypt. Given the nature of their wealth it is not surprising that they directed their investments almost exclusively towards land and
all their profits were used to purchase even more land, in order to increase the size of their estates or for the purpose of speculation. Such a class, therefore, would have a vested interest in securing the highest possible prices for their cotton and they were quite aware that this could not be attained in the local market. Thus, this period also saw the development of a coincidence of interests between the Egyptian agrarian bourgeoisie, which was in the process of consolidating its power, and the representative of British economic and political interests, Lord Cromer.

Nevertheless, the Egyptian industrial sector did experience some limited growth during this period. In fact, in contrast to the mining and the commercial sector, it was industry which received most investment. Furthermore, the table below indicates that the proportion of capital invested in industry grew rapidly during these two decades and by 1897, this sector received one quarter of all capital investment.

Table 3.28: Paid-up Capital and Debentures of Industrial Companies, 1883 - 1897 (As a percentage of total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CAPITAL (£000)</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crouchley, 1936: 105

As to the type and nature of this industrial development, it was determined by the direction and characteristics of the entire Egyptian economy. In general, the industries that were established during these two decades can be grouped into three categories:

a) the processing of raw cotton for exports (ginning and pressing) which represented 15% of paid-up capital,

b) industries protected by the high transport cost of bulky or perishable inputs or outputs such as sugar, beer, cement, bakeries, salt and caustic soda,
c) industries traditionally established in Egypt because of their comparative advantage such as Turkish cigarettes, cotton-seed, oil and soap. (Radwan, 1974: 169)

Another characteristic of the industrial sector was that practically all the initiatives were undertaken by Europeans who resided in Egypt. The main reason being, that Europeans were...

...protected by the capitulations and well connected with foreign markets and sources of finance...[thus, they] were in a better position to promote industrial projects. But these investments were limited to those industries where foreigners had a traditional skill acquired from working in handicrafts in their countries of origin (Turkish cigarettes introduced by Greeks and soap by Syrians), or those representing a vertical extension of cotton (ginning and pressing, extraction of cotton-seed oil and soap). (Radwan, 1974: 242)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRIES</th>
<th>NO. OF COMPANIES</th>
<th>CAPITAL &amp; DEBENTURES</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cotton Ginning &amp; Pressing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>532.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cotton Textiles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>292.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tobacco and Cigarettes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Soft Drinks and Beer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bakeries and Flour Mills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sugar Processing &amp; Refining</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,795.0</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Oil and Soap</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Salt and Soda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>301.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Radwan, 1974: 171

Given the privileged status of the Europeans, it is not surprising that the structure of the Egyptian industrial sector reflected both the interests of Europeans and their consumption patterns. Furthermore, one of the effects of European investment in Egyptian industry is that it contributed to an increase in the presence of Europeans in the major urban centres. In 1882, the foreign population in Egypt numbered, 90,886, and by 1897, it had increased to 112,574, which an increase of almost twenty-four per cent. Even so this foreign population represented only just over one per cent of the total Egyptian population
in that same year. (Crouchley, 1938: 256) Nevertheless, despite its insignificant representation in the total population figures, this foreign population controlled the majority of the capital that was invested in the industrial sector. Furthermore, it should also be noted that British and French capital represented the vast majority of all investment by Europeans in Egyptian industry. For example, in 1902, out of a total foreign investment of 24,642,000 Egyptian pounds, almost eighty-seven per cent was British and French capital and just over ten per cent was Belgian. (Crouchley, 1936: 46)

Table 3.30: Companies Containing Capital from Abroad, 1902
Arranged According to Nationality of Controlling Interests (£E,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANIES</th>
<th>ENGLAND</th>
<th>FRANCE</th>
<th>BELGIUM</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>CAPITAL</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind. &amp; Com.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9,977</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11,548</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crouchley, 1936: 46

Table 3.31: Companies in Egypt - Paid-up capital, 1902
According to Nationality (£E,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPANIES</th>
<th>FOREIGN CAPITAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
<th>EGYPTIAN CAPITAL</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>10,525</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks &amp; Financial</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>3,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry &amp; Commerce</td>
<td>5,903</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>24,642</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>2,301</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>26,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crouchley, 1936: 45

The figures presented above relate only to the investment of capital in a number of companies across the various sectors of the Egyptian economy. They do exemplify, however, the dominant role of Europeans in
the Egyptian economy and its dependent status in the international division of labour. What is particularly important, and needs to be emphasised, is that this situation, although initiated in the late 1860s and during the 1870s, in fact developed more quickly during the last two decades of the nineteenth century and under the guidance of Lord Cromer. From a prosperous country which experienced an important agricultural revolution in the first half of the nineteenth century, Egypt became a dependent economy and lost her political sovereignty by the end of the century. It was during the process of these important structural transformations that the Greek community in Alexandria also flourished. It is important, therefore, to examine in some detail the economic activities of this community during the nineteenth century.
1. It should be noted that most of the historical data in this chapter is taken primarily from secondary sources written in English in order to permit the non-Arabic reader to pursue points of interest. Furthermore, Crouchley (1936 & 1938) and Owen (1969) have been used extensively because they are the major secondary sources used by all scholars whether writing in Arabic or a European language. Nevertheless, the analytical framework in this chapter is distinctly different from that used by either Crouchley or Owen.

2. It is important to note here that the process of dispossessing peasants did not mean that small peasant producers did not have access to land. In fact, as Crouchley points out below there was a shortage of labour. Thus, it is possible to conclude that a process of differentiation and privatisation of land was taking place, but peasants were still tied to their land through various forms of tenancy agreements. A rural proletariat did not emerge. For an elaboration of this point, see Glavanis (1984).
CHAPTER FOUR

Capitalist Pioneers in an Agrarian Society:
Aspects of the Economic Role of the Greeks in Alexandria

The previous chapter highlighted aspects of the economic changes experienced by Egyptian society during the nineteenth century. It is within this general framework that this chapter will attempt to provide a conspectus of the economic activities of the Greek community in Alexandria during the same historical period. As already noted in previous chapters, many of the Greeks in Alexandria took advantage of the major trends and changes occurring in the Egyptian economy and socio-political structure during the nineteenth century and accumulated vast fortunes which also enabled them to play a central role in the process of socio-economic and political transformation. This present chapter will demonstrate the manner in which many Greek merchants in Alexandria accumulated their large fortunes and achieved their important social status: primarily through their participation in the Egyptian cotton trade.

Chapter three, however, also noted that the major changes experienced by the Egyptian economy during the nineteenth century were in some respects related to transformations occurring on a global scale and especially the development and expansion of European capitalism. Furthermore, chapter two already indicated that the process of Greek emigration to Egypt during the nineteenth century was also closely connected to the important socio-economic and political transformations being experienced within European society during the same historical period. Thus, it is
possible to suggest that in order to present a critical evaluation of the economic role of the Greeks in Alexandria it is necessary to do so in the context of an analytical framework which relates the economic and social experience of Egyptian society with the transformations occurring in European society and the international division of labour.

This framework has already been elaborated in the Introduction and in some detail in the previous chapters, and emphasises the articulation of forces, internal and external, in the context of the evolving hegemony of global capitalism. Thus, it is an approach which avoids the ethnocentric approach adopted by most Middle East historians and exemplified in the previous discussion of the work of P. J. Vatikiotis (1969) and Peter Gran (1979). It may be argued, however, that both these scholars focussed on socio-cultural and political issues and thus were inadvertently led to adopt such an ethnocentric approach. Thus, it is necessary to consider, albeit briefly, the extent to which the same approach emerges in the work of economic historians of the Middle East. This can be accomplished by examining the work of Roger Owen, and in particular his book entitled The Middle East in the World Economy, 1800 - 1914 (1981), which is generally considered by Middle East scholars as an important contribution to the literature on the economic history of the Middle East.

In many respects Eric Hobsbawm's two classic texts, The Age of Revolution (1973) and The Age of Capital (1977), which cover the periods 1789 to 1848 and 1848 to 1875 respectively, exemplify the main forces and changes which developed within Europe and had a direct effect on socio-economic and political developments in the Middle East in general, and Egypt in particular. Roger Owen concurs on this point when he notes that
If a single word is needed to describe the general state of the Middle East economy as it existed in this period (1800) it would have to be 'stagnant'. At the end of the eighteenth century the growing political and economic power of western Europe found expression in two great revolutions: the French and the Industrial. Their effect on the Middle East was profound. The one encouraged a series of reforms by the rulers of both the Ottoman Empire and the semi-independent province of Egypt designed to allow them to withstand the increasingly dangerous threat of political and military intervention by Britain and the continental powers, the other produced a huge increase in trade which began the complete transformation of the region's economy. (Owen, 1981: 55-7)

In keeping with the conventional analytical framework employed by most historians of the Middle East, however, Owen attributes analytical priority to the 'dual revolution' taking place in European society and suggests that economic changes of a fundamental kind was initiated in Europe and only affected the Middle East because of the expansion of trade between the two regions. (Owen, 1981: 83-99) Such an argument ignores the significance of the internal economic transformations initiated in Egypt during the Muhammad 'Ali period in both encouraging and structuring the nature of trade relations between Europe and the Middle East. Owen, for example, characterises the place of the Middle East in these global transformations as emanating primarily from a particular type of response to the political revolutions in the West and especially the Napoleonic wars which

...had the effect of stimulating the rulers of Egypt and Turkey to create new military organizations based on conscription rather than the use of mercenaries, equipped with modern weapons and trained according to the most modern tactics. But such policies in turn, required large sums of money and led, inexorably, to an attempt to increase the revenues which the governments obtained from a variety of sources, the most important of which was the tax placed on the land and its produce. (Owen, 1981: 57)

There is, then, a suggestion in Owen's analysis that the changes experienced by Egyptian society during the nineteenth century were primarily motivated by the desire of Muhammad 'Ali and his successors to
establish a modern and powerful army. Furthermore, Owen goes on to argue that "at the same time that Muhammad Ali and the Turkish sultans were beginning their programmes of military reform, fundamental changes were also taking place in the nature of trade between the Middle East and Europe." (Owen, 1981: 83) In other words, the Middle Eastern and Egyptian response to the revolutionary transformations experienced by European society from 1789 to 1875 was the result of an articulation between their desire to modernise their military forces and thus their increasing need for large revenues and the expanding European commercial networks which incorporated the eastern Mediterranean region. As such, Owen locates himself squarely within the conventional scholarship which attributes to Europe the analytical priority in initiating transformations in the Middle East region.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to attempt to engage in a critical re-writing of nineteenth century Middle Eastern economic history, but it is necessary to emphasise that such an interpretation denies the Middle East, conceptually at least, any role in the global transformations being discussed by such scholars as Eric Hobsbawm. No role, of course, other than that presented and argued by most Orientalists which places emphasis on the militaristic nature of Middle Eastern and Islamic society. The inadequacy of such an implicit Eurocentric approach to the study of non-European societies is quite evident in that it fails to examine the internal dynamics of such societies as Egypt which may have in fact contributed actively to the very process of capitalist development and expansion. In fact, Eric Hobsbawm seems to suggest such an alternative approach when he notes "...the impossibility of any longer writing a purely European history, [and that] it would be absurd
to write about it [capitalist transformations] without paying substantial attention to other continents." (Hobsbawm, 1977: 9)

In qualification of Roger Owen's Eurocentric and Orientalist approach, the alternative analytical framework being used in this study is based upon an elaboration of Eric Hobsbawm's point by emphasising the necessity to understand the manner in which non-European societies contributed actively to the nature and structure of global capitalist development. Such an approach denies the ethnocentric and economic determinist approach which suggests that "...the expansion of empire was consciously decreed by a small coterie of capitalists associated with the Stock Exchange and the great banks of England." (Davis & Huttenback, 1988: 5) Similarly, it rejects the equally ethnocentric approach of such scholars as Peter Gran (1979) which attributes analytical priority to internal Egyptian transformations. Instead, the emphasis is placed on an attempt to understand the manner in which the changes taking place within Egyptian society related to the transformations on a world scale and thus incorporated Egypt into the process of global and regional capitalist development as a dependent social formation.

Thus, within such an analytical framework, the Greeks in Alexandria are neither European agents of capitalist transformation (external) nor can they be seen as an indigenous force which initiated capitalist transformations independently of global and regional developments (internal). The former represents the approach adopted by most Middle East scholars while the latter represents the approach of many Greek scholars in Egypt. Instead, the alternative analytical framework locates the Greeks in Alexandria in a mediating role between internal and external transformations and thus attributes to them an analytical significance due to their central role in this process of articulation.
The rest of this chapter, therefore, will examine aspects of the economic activities of some prominent Greeks in Alexandria in order to elaborate on these issues and suggest a possible alternative approach to the study of the role of non-European societies in the development of capitalism.
I. Alexandria: A Greek Bourgeois City

There are a number of well documented indicators, presented in different parts of this study, which suggest that the Greeks in Egypt constituted the most important bourgeois socio-economic category in the country and that the city of Alexandria was practically a Greek city during the nineteenth century. One of the most obvious reasons as to why Alexandria became the centre of Greek merchant, finance and industrial activities during this period is that historically this city possessed an excellent natural harbour. It is not surprising that the first Greeks to emigrate to Egypt during the early part of the nineteenth century would choose to settle in a location which would permit them to maintain their contacts with the regional and European commercial networks. This is especially so since most of these early immigrants were primarily merchants with already well established connections to the commercial networks of the eastern Mediterranean, and southern and northern Europe. Alexandria, therefore, as at the time of Alexander the Great, became the obvious location for the Greek bourgeois entrepreneurs who emigrated to Egypt, in the first instance, in order to enhance their commercial profits.

Alexandria had one major drawback in the early part of the nineteenth century. There was no direct and easy connection to the fertile agricultural hinterland of Egypt in which all the potential exports were located. As was indicated in the previous chapter, however, Muhammad 'Ali's projects of improving the infrastructure necessary to encourage commercial and especially export-oriented economic activities resolved this problem. The Mahmudiyya canal, which was constructed as part of these extensive projects, linked Alexandria for the first time in its long history to the Delta and thus provided the city with a direct
waterway to the heart of Egypt's agricultural land. Subsequent to the completion of the canal in the early 1820s, and the establishment of the rail and telegraphic links with other major cities in the 1850s, the city of Alexandria began to develop rapidly and by the end of the century was by far the most important and prosperous city in Egypt.

These infrastructural developments contributed greatly to the enhancement of the status of Alexandria both as the most important commercial centre in Egypt and eventually in the eastern Mediterranean. Not only did the Mahmudiyya canal permit the rapid, easy and safe transportation of commodities, but the telegraphic service also enabled merchants in Alexandria to be in touch with any developments taking place in Cairo or other Egyptian regions. This, of course, was particularly important with regard to price fluctuations and availability of certain agricultural commodities in the agrarian hinterland. It was the improvement of the port and docking facilities in Alexandria, however, which could be said to constitute the most important development in terms of securing Alexandria's regional supremacy in commercial activities in the eastern Mediterranean. The merchants were keen to be in touch with developments in Egypt, but more so with the changes in market demands and prices in Europe and the rest of the Mediterranean. The new port and docking facilities permitted steam ships to arrive in Alexandria, and thus provided the merchants with a relatively efficient and speedy means of access to commercial developments in European and other Mediterranean markets.

The centrality of Greek merchants in these structural developments experienced by the city of Alexandria during the Muhammad 'Ali period was due primarily to two factors. First, commercial and practically all other economic activities in Egypt, during this period, were under the
strict control of the State, thus ignoring the clauses of the Capitulations and especially of the 1838 Anglo-Turkish Commercial Treaty. In fact, Muhammad 'Ali excluded European merchants from any State controlled commercial activity because he feared that they would use their respective consular protection to undermine his own control over Egypt's commercial and especially export economic activities. Up to 1833, however, Greek merchants arriving in Alexandria could not take advantage of the Capitulations, due to the absence of a Greek Consulate, and thus did not pose a threat to Muhammad 'Ali's control of the commercial and export activities of Egypt. Thus, Muhammad 'Ali preferred to deal with the Greek merchants as individuals, and he developed a network of personal relations which completely bypassed the other European merchants who were in a position to use the Capitulations because they had Consular protection.

Hadziiossif (1980), who has examined the archives of the French Consulate in Alexandria during the period of Muhammad 'Ali, indicates that the bulk of the correspondence between the French Consul-General and Paris consisted primarily of complaints with regards to Muhammad 'Ali's exclusion of French merchants from Egypt's commercial and export activities. In a number of dispatches the French Consul-General mentions the names of Michalis Tossitsas, Ioannis d'Anastasy and Etienne (Stefanos) Zizinias as being the sole merchants receiving privileges from Muhammad 'Ali at the expense of all other European merchants. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 93-108) In fact, Hadziiossif notes that this correspondence refers to these Greek merchants as "negociants aux services du Vice-Roi" or as "agents commerciaux du gouvernement". (Hadziiossif, 1980: 97)
Nevertheless, in addition to the Greek merchants who did not have Consular protection, there were other regional and Egyptian merchants with whom Muhammad 'Ali could have established similar personal economic relations. Thus, it is necessary to explain his almost exclusive focus on a few Greek merchants. The answer to such a question constitutes the second reason which permitted the Greeks to play a central role in the commercial activities of Egypt. Most of the early Greek immigrants to Egypt were not only merchants, but in fact merchants who had already well established contacts with the European and regional markets. In order to sustain his State monopolies, which excluded European merchants, and simultaneously ensure that he had adequate knowledge of market forces in Europe and the Mediterranean, Muhammad 'Ali was forced to rely on "agents" who were already well established in these markets. As previous chapters have indicated, the Greek merchants in Alexandria were part of a wider Greek commercial network which emerged in the eighteenth century and extended from within the Ottoman Empire to most European and Mediterranean commercial centres. Given these two factors and the personal friendships that had already been established outside Egypt between Muhammad 'Ali and such Greek merchants as Michalis Tossitsas, it is not surprising that a few Greek merchants in Alexandria were to play a central role in Egypt's economic transformations during this period.

Indicating the reasons as to why a few Greek merchants in Alexandria were able to play a central role in Egypt's commercial activities does not, of course, necessarily suggest why the Greek community of Alexandria was also able to prosper and transform Alexandria into a Greek city. This is a particularly important issue that needs to be addressed in order to avoid presenting an interpretation which relies on
ethnic identity or solidarity for an account of the prominent status of the Greek community in Alexandria. This issue, therefore, needs to be analysed within a wider context which examines the specific nature of commercial relations within Alexandria during the Muhammad 'Ali period. As already indicated above and in the previous chapter, commercial and other economic activities during this period were primarily determined by Muhammad 'Ali's socio-political considerations rather than market forces. The reliance on previously established personal friendships permitted Muhammad 'Ali to carry out his political objectives while at the same time successfully implementing his state-initiated transformation of the Egyptian economy. The few privileged Greek merchants, however, could not deal with all of Egypt's commerce on their own. They, therefore, also had to rely on smaller merchants in order to move the merchandise and to maintain close contacts with the European and Mediterranean markets. It is this which encouraged them in turn to rely extensively on the already established Greek commercial network in these areas. Of course, as Egypt's commercial economy prospered during the Muhammad 'Ali period, many of these Greek merchants came to settle in Alexandria. Thus, the Greek community of Alexandria grew in numbers and also prospered due to the patronage of men such as Tossitsas, d'Anastasy and Zizinias.

It is, therefore, possible to suggest that it was a combination of socio-political, economic and ethnic considerations which permitted the Greeks in Alexandria to play such a central role in the rapid transformation of Egypt's economy during the Muhammad 'Ali period. This was primarily due to the fact that market relations were primarily characterised by personal and family ties rather than market forces. Many merchant houses in the Mediterranean were essentially family
enterprises. It is not surprising, therefore, that so many of the early prominent Greek merchants in Alexandria were in fact related. Having established a privileged status in the city of Alexandria and its commercial activities during the Muhammad 'Ali period, the Greeks were compelled to rely even more on the "ethnic" dimension in order to safeguard this status. This was especially the case after the Muhammad 'Ali period when they were forced to deal with the new challenge posed by the better organised and politically powerful British, French, etc. merchants and commercial establishments. In Egypt, this challenge was reflected from the 1850s in the new power of the European Consul-Generals, and especially those of Britain and France, who were able to force the successors of Muhammad 'Ali to grant privileges to their respective citizens. The Crimean War period, already discussed in chapter two, is a pertinent example of the effects of these new socio-political circumstances on the status of the Greeks in Alexandria. Unlike the British and French Consul-Generals, the Greek Consul-General, representing as he did a small Mediterranean state, was powerless in his attempts to safeguard the interests of the Greeks. This is clearly reflected in a letter dated the 21st of November, 1856, from the Greek Consul-General in Alexandria in which he notes:

The truth is that the Viceroy grants no privileges to Hellenic commerce. On the contrary he creates many difficulties to those Greeks who have been forced by the circumstances [Crimean War] to come under his jurisdiction. It would, therefore, be very justified and reasonable to take advantage of the opportunity of presenting him with the Grand Cross [Greek honourable medal], if not to request from the Viceroy commercial privileges and other privileges as is being done by the other Consuls in such circumstances, but at least to request justice with regards to our citizens and the settlement of old disputes. [my translation] (Foreign Affairs, 1856: 36-1)

Given the ineffectiveness of the Greek Consul-General and the increasing power of the British and French Consul-Generals, the Greek community of
Alexandria was forced to rely upon its internal, personal, family and "ethnic" relations in order to sustain privileges, status and wealth that had been achieved during the Muhammad 'Ali period. This reinforced a pattern of family-based and "ethnic" economic relations within the community and constituted one of the major factors which was to divide the community when some of the Greeks in Alexandria started to represent the interests of British capital in the second half of the nineteenth century. The development of this fundamentally economic contradiction, however, took the form of an ideological and "ethnic" conflict which will be discussed in some detail in the following chapter.

The privileged status of the Greek merchants in Alexandria during the Muhammad 'Ali period and the deterioration of their status in the subsequent decades can be elaborated further by reference to the export of the most important Egyptian commercial commodity, cotton. The previous chapter underlined the significance that Muhammad 'Ali attached to cotton exports and that he relied heavily on a few prominent merchants in order to ensure its sale in the European markets at the most favourable prices. Up to the 1830s, Egyptian cotton was primarily exported to Marseilles and Trieste via the four major commercial establishments owned by Michalis Tossitsas, Ioannis d'Anastasy, Stefanos Zizinias and the French Pastré brothers. (Hadzilossif, 1980: 113) The importance of these four commercial establishments was due to the fact that cotton prices fluctuated in the European markets as a result of developments that took place in a number of cotton producing countries around the world, and especially in the cotton growing states of North America. Furthermore, Egyptian cotton exports constituted such a small percentage of total consumption in Europe that it was not possible to influence the European market prices. Thus, it was necessary for
Muhammad 'Ali to try to anticipate the price fluctuations in the European markets and for this he relied heavily on the few merchants who had well established contacts in these markets.

Nevertheless, the prominent position held by these few Greek merchants in the export of Egypt's most lucrative commercial commodity changed dramatically after the death of Muhammad 'Ali. Not only did these merchants lose their exclusive monopoly, but the direction of Egyptian cotton exports also changed. As indicated in the previous chapter, from the end of the 1840s, Britain became the primary recipient of Egyptian cotton and by the 1870s received over eighty percent of the total exported. Tossitsas, d'Anastasy, and Zizinias, however, did not have commercial contacts in Britain and thus lost their exclusive monopoly. It is at that moment, of course, that new merchants with well established contacts in Britain entered the market in Alexandria and posed a successful challenge to the status of the Greek merchants. Several of these new merchants were however also Greeks, but with the important difference that they were either working for British commercial enterprises or they collaborated closely with British capital. Such Greek merchants as Choremis and Benakis eventually became the leading exporters of Egyptian cotton from Alexandria, but their role in the affairs of the Greek community of Alexandria differed significantly from that of Tossitsas and Zizinias.

A significant difference between the new Greek merchants and the prominent early Greek immigrant merchants was that the former were also well connected to sophisticated and powerful financial establishments in Britain and France. It was this factor which played a central role in the decline of the early Greek immigrants and permitted the new ones to establish themselves as the new socio-economic elite in the Greek
In distinct contrast, the early Greek immigrants relied almost exclusively on a credit system that was internal to the regional network of Greek merchants. This was one of the factors which encouraged Muhammad 'Ali to rely on these few Greek merchants for most of his commercial and financial requirements. Their access to this informal and internal credit system permitted them to move large quantities of merchandise within the region and also enabled them to raise funds when Muhammad 'Ali needed to secure a State loan. This was particularly important for Muhammad 'Ali who was reluctant to borrow money but preferred to sell agricultural crops when he needed cash for his modernisation projects. Furthermore, having almost exclusive access to a regional credit system which extended from Alexandria to Malta, Marseilles, Trieste, Smyrna and Istanbul, these few prominent Greek merchants in Alexandria were able to determine their own exchange rates, interest rates and in general profit margins with no fear of competition. (al-Hakim, 1873: 28-30; Hadziiossif, 1980: 152-4)

Thus, this regional Greek system of commercial credit permitted these few prominent merchants also to act as the sole financial and banking establishments in Alexandria, and thereby enhanced even more their control, power and status in this city.

Nevertheless, it should not be concluded from the above that there were no financial or banking institutions in Alexandria during the Muhammad 'Ali period. On the contrary, the archives of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria and the report produced by John Bowring (1840) indicate that there were a number of small family-based financial and banking establishments in Alexandria. Most of these, however, were Greek establishments and had either direct or indirect contact with the regional Greek commercial network or had been established with the
assistance of the prominent Greek merchants in that city. For example, the establishment of Ghoussios, Glavanis and Company, appears in the Consular archives of 1844 as a bank. (Foreign Affairs, 1844: 36-1) Theodoros Glavanis was a Greek immigrant merchant from Arta in Epiros, and came to Alexandria in the early 1840s with the help of Michalis Tossitsas who was also from the same Greek province. In addition to his commercial activities, which consisted primarily of trading in coal, (Hadziiossif, 1980: 185) Glavanis also established with Ghoussios a small bank which concentrated on exchange and the financing of small scale commerce between Egypt and Epiros which was still an Ottoman province.

The only major financial or banking establishment that operated in Alexandria during this period was The Bank of Egypt, which was jointly controlled by Muhammad 'Ali, Michalis Tossitsas and Jules Pastré. This bank was established in 1843, with Muhammad 'Ali investing 400,000 Austrian thalers while Tossitsas and Pastré invested 150,000 Austrian thalers each. The reason behind the establishment of this bank was to attempt to regulate the exchange rates in the city of Alexandria and thus the bank was given the exclusive right to collect all dues, tariffs and administrative expenses payed by merchants at the port. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 191-3) This bank did not last more than two years, however, because most merchants continued to rely on the informal regional Greek commercial network and bypassed the bank in their exchange activities. The main reason for the failure was that the bank did not offer credit terms while the informal regional Greek network did. It was not until 1856 that another Greek financier, Paschalis, relying on British capital this time, established the first joint stock company with limited liability and named it The Bank of Egypt. As was
the case in the commercial sector, the establishment of this bank in 1856 marked the end of the monopoly over the financial market in Alexandria that had been exercised by these few prominent Greek merchants. Furthermore, and again as with the commercial sector, the new prominent financiers were also Greek, but with connections with different financial networks, British and French.

It is clear from the above discussion that Muhammad 'Ali gave a few Greek merchants in Alexandria extensive privileges, and thus permitted the rest of the Greek community in that city to achieve significant status and wealth, for reasons other than simple friendship or ethnic considerations. It was primarily due to the fact that the Greeks in Alexandria were well connected to an extensive regional commercial network which served the socio-economic and political interests of Muhammad 'Ali. This was particularly obvious with regards to the Greek commercial fleet which operated in the Mediterranean. Given the centrality of exports in Muhammad 'Ali's economic policies, the means of facilitating these exports was a primary consideration. In the early part of the nineteenth century, the vast majority of the commercial vessels sailing in the Mediterranean were owned by Greeks. Nevertheless, most historians have failed to indicate the significance of the Greek commercial fleet in the Mediterranean because until 1829, the establishment of the Kingdom of the Hellenes, no Greek ship flew a Greek flag and after that date a large majority continued to fly other flags. Those ships originating in Samos, for example, flew an Ottoman flag until 1912, while those originating in the Ionian islands flew a British flag until 1864.

Through to the end of the Muhammad 'Ali period, the Greek ships arriving in Alexandria constituted over seventy percent of all commercial vessels
arriving at this port. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 203) Nevertheless, two important developments contributed to the decline of the number of Greek ships arriving in Alexandria from the 1850s on. First, the majority of the Greek ships were small and relied upon sail which prevented them from competing with the larger and steam-powered vessels that began to arrive in the Mediterranean in the early 1850s. This was particularly the case with regards to cotton exports which were both bulky and heavy. Second, when Egypt's exports started to be directed towards Liverpool in the late 1850s, the Greek ships were unable to make the long voyage. The Greek commercial fleet during the nineteenth century was essentially a Mediterranean fleet composed of small cargo vessels, but during the second half of the century Egyptian exports were primarily bulky cotton bales and directed towards Britain.

It was during the Muhammad 'Ali period that the Greek commercial fleet played a central role in facilitating Egypt's export economy, and thus contributed to the status and wealth of the Greek community in Alexandria. It was the dues paid by these Greek ships to the Greek Consulate in Alexandria, for example, which sustained the Greek hospital in Alexandria. Furthermore, many of the Greek sailors abandoned ship in Alexandria and thus contributed to the growth of the Greek community in that city. Finally, the regular arrival of a large number of Greek ships in Alexandria permitted many Greeks in Greece and the Ottoman Empire to acquaint themselves with the increasing prosperity of this city and thus to decide to emigrate there in order to improve their economic status. This was particularly the case with those Greeks who lived in the Greek islands and the Ottoman coastal towns from which most of the Greek ships originated.
The significance of the arrival of so many Greek ships in Alexandria during the Muhammad 'Ali period extends beyond the fact that they contributed to Egypt's export economy. As indicated above, these ships also facilitated the arrival of many Greeks as immigrants to Alexandria and thus contributed both to the growth of the community and its diversification. Many of those who worked their passage on a Greek ship to Alexandria were either craftsmen, small merchants or ordinary folk. The archives of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria, for example, indicate that of those Greeks who were registered with the Consulate in 1842, thirty-one percent listed their occupation as craftsmen of various sorts and twenty-six percent indicated that they were employed in the service sector. (Foreign Affairs, 1843: 36-1) Thus, fifty-seven percent of those Greeks registered in the Consulate were not involved in either commercial or financial activities. These figures, of course, do not include all those Greeks who originated from areas of Greece still under Ottoman occupation and who had been unable to arrange for Greek citizenship. The ability to receive Greek citizenship necessitated a certain amount of expenditure and most of these immigrants were too poor to afford it. It is possible to conclude, therefore, that those Greeks in Alexandria who did not participate directly in either commercial or financial activities constituted a majority of the entire community.

An examination of the archives of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria for the year 1847 indicates forty-six different occupations other than merchant or financier. For example, there were twenty-six grocers, thirty-two employees (i.e. working in firms or shops), thirty-two tailors, nine carpenters, seven servants, four bakers, six coffee-shop owners, four tobacco salesmen, three shoe-makers, five artisans, two house painters, etc. (Foreign Affairs, 1849: 58-2) From this partial
listing of occupations it may be deduced that the Greeks in Alexandria were represented in practically all aspects of socio-economic and cultural activity. In this sense they occupied a unique position in this city as compared with all other foreign communities. Not only were they numerous and controlled most of the wealth generating activities, but they also contributed to the entire spectrum of socio-economic activities expected in a prosperous bourgeois city. Nevertheless, it was the Greek merchants and financiers who played a central role in the establishment of the community, its prosperity, development and status in Egyptian society; and it was they who ensured that Alexandria became a Greek bourgeois city.
II. Mercantile and Finance Capital, 1830 - 1882

It is within the analytical framework presented above and the fact that Alexandria was a bourgeois city in the making during the Muhammad 'Ali period, that aspects of the economic activities of the prominent Greek immigrants in that city will be examined in some detail. As already noted, the early Greek immigrants took advantage of the prominent trends and changes occurring in the Egyptian economy, and thus their initial focus was commercial activities and especially those related to the export of cotton to Europe. Later, during this period, some of the wealthier Greek merchants embarked on financial and banking activities, and finally, on a much smaller scale, they also engaged themselves in initiating manufacturing activities.

The prominent role of the Greek immigrants in Egyptian commercial and especially export activities is in distinct contrast to the nature of trade relations between Egypt and Greece during the first half of the nineteenth century. Even after the first Kingdom of the Hellenes was established in the late-1820s, trade relations between the two countries were almost insignificant. This is well documented in the archives of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria where much of the correspondence between Michalis Tossitsas, Greek Consul-General, and the Greek authorities from 1833 to 1854 relates primarily with the concern of the latter to improve trade links with Egypt. Of course, the most clear indication both of the prominence of the Greeks in Alexandria and Greece's concern to improve trade relations with Egypt is the fact that one of the very first initiatives of the new Greek Minister of Foreign Affairs, Tricoupis, was to enlist the services of Michalis Tossitsas as the first Greek Consul-General in Egypt. On the 18th of August, 1833, Tossitsas received a letter from Tricoupis in which the latter informed
him that "...Sa Majeste [Hellenique] a juge utile et convenable aux
interets du commerce de ses sujets d'etablir un consul en Egypte. Elle
vous a choisi pour remplir ce poste, a la suite du compte qui lui a ete
rendu de votre probite et de vos connaissances." [my emphasis] (Politis,
1929: 206)

It is clear from the above letter that the new Greek government was
primarily concerned with the establishment of trade relations with Egypt
and that Tossitsas was chosen because of his well known relations with
Muhammad 'Ali. This is further underlined by the fact that in less
than a month Tossitsas received a second letter, dated the 14th of
September, 1833, in which Tricoupis implored him to devote urgent
attention to the matter of "...faciliter les communications
[mercantiles] entre la Grece et l'Egypte et de donner, en meme temps,
une plus grande etendue aux relations qui existent deja entre les deux
pays." [my emphasis] (Politis, 1929: 234) Given that the new Greek
government had in fact just been established, the relations between the
two countries mentioned in Tricoupis' letter clearly referred to the
prosperous and prominent Greek community in Alexandria, who in fact were
still Ottoman citizens when the letter was written.

The Greek government, however, was keen to take advantage of the status
of the Greeks in Alexandria in order to assist the development of a
modern Greek economy which had just emerged from over four hundred years
of Ottoman occupation. Thus, the same letter by Tricoupis, informed
Tossitsas that the Greek government had already arranged for several
commercial ships to commute regularly between the liberated parts of
Greece and Alexandria in order to facilitate the improvement of
commercial relations. The letter then requested that Tossitsas use his
influence in order that these ships might be "...exemptes des droits
It is obvious that the Greek government was well aware of the prominent status of Michalis Tossitsas and thus wished to benefit from it and receive exclusive privileges from the Egyptian State. It appears, however, that Tossitsas was unable to accomplish this task because there is no indication in the consular archives that Greek commercial ships were exempt from charges and tariffs at the port of Alexandria, or for that matter a letter from Tossitsas responding to Tricoupis' request. Tossitsas was clearly aware of the nature of the privileges he received from Muhammad 'Ali and was not about to endanger his own commercial activities for the sake of enhancing the profit margin of other Greek merchants.

The reserved manner in which Tossitsas responded to requests to assist his own government in improving commercial relations with Egypt was in distinct contrast to the constant requests for special privileges that he received from Tricoupis who was also Minister for Foreign Trade. It appears that Tossitsas reached some limit of tolerance for on the 2nd. of December, 1833, he wrote directly to the Minister of State at the Royal Palace, Mavrocordatos, suggesting certain principles that need to be accepted if trade relations between the two countries were to improve. Mavrocordatos seems to have read the message clearly and in a letter dated the 31st. of December, 1833, he informed Tossitsas that

"...vous remarquez justment qu'en vue de son encouragement, des dispositions sont aussi necessaires quant aux devoirs et à la conduite des marins et des commerçants. Par les instructions que nous porterons aussi à la connaissance des susdits intéresses, nous croyons que la question sera prévue d'une manière satisfaisante. Les consulats, la loi en main, auront l'autorité nécessaire pour intervenir dans les affaires concernant leurs régimicole et mettre fin justment aux désordres. (Politis, 1929: 234-5)"
It is clear from the above, that in distinct contrast to the role of most European Consul-Generals, Tossitsas was primarily concerned with sustaining the privileges accorded by Muhammad 'Ali to the Greeks already resident in Alexandria, under the patronage of a few wealthy Greek merchants, rather than advocating special privileges for his government and its citizens. Of course, this is precisely one of the main reasons for which Muhammad 'Ali was willing to cooperate so closely with him and accord him such a prominent and privileged status in the economic affairs of Egypt. Nevertheless, the Greek State continued to request special privileges for Greek citizens resident in Greece, but who wished to take advantage of Egypt's prosperity in order to improve their economic situation since the Greek economy was relatively impoverished.

This is made clear in a letter dated the 27th of January, 1837, in which the Greek Minister of Navigation, Ioannis Rizos, requested certain privileges for the Greek commercial fleet in order to further the development of commercial ties between the two countries. (Politis, 1929: 235) Tossitsas did not seem to be impressed by the request and on the 9th of March, 1837, responded by noting that "...si depuis quelque temps on remarquait un arret dans ce development [commercial relations between the two countries], cela etait du a certains exces qu'avaient commis les navires grecs." (Politis, 1929: 235) Unlike other European Consul-Generals, Tossitsas was not about to defend Greek citizens who had broken Egyptian laws. In this sense Tossitsas confirmed that although he was of Greek origin, and in fact was the Greek Consul-General, his primary loyalties were to the development of the Egyptian economy. This is not surprising, of course, since his own wealth was derived from the prosperity of the Egyptian economy and he was not about
to undermine it for the sake of some political loyalty to the Greek state.

Nevertheless, economic relations between Greece and Egypt did improve during the Muhammad 'Ali period. This was primarily reflected by the fact that Greek commercial vessels continued to be the largest majority of all ships arriving in Alexandria. In 1836, for example, the number of Greek ships arriving in Alexandria were the largest for any one country, which were followed by British and then Austrian vessels. (Scott, 1937, Vol.2: 22) Actual trade, however, between the two countries was of far less significance. In that same year, out of a total of 121,877,000 French francs of foreign trade from the port of Alexandria, only 2,180,000 or under two percent was with Greece. (Clot Bey, 1840, Vol.2: 7 & 14)

In distinct contrast to trade relations between Egypt and Greece, the Greek merchants in Alexandria occupied a prominent and influential position in the city. John Bowring (1840), for example, who recorded the most prominent merchants in the city of Alexandria on the 13th. of December, 1837, listed seventy-two merchants, of which fourteen were Greek. Although these fourteen represented only one fifth of the total, they were in fact the largest single ethnic category. They were followed by the French, Austrian, Tuscanese and British. Egypt, Denmark, Ottoman Empire, Tunisia, Turkey, and the United States of America were each represented by only one merchant. (Bowring, 1840: 80-1) The significance of the fourteen Greek merchants was further emphasised in a report by the French Consul-General dated 1851, in which he notes that the Greek merchants in Alexandria controlled between sixty and sixty-two percent of all commercial capital in the city in that year. Furthermore, the report concluded by noting that "...les trois
quarts du commerce d'Alexandrie et par conséquent de l'Egypte avec l'Europe sont faits par des négociants grecs ou d'origine grecque."

(quoted in Hadziiossif, 1980: 252-3)

One of the problems encountered in an attempt to determine the exact role of the Greek merchants in Alexandria during the Muhammad 'Ali period derives from the fact that many of them held other citizenships, and thus were not registered in the Greek Consular archives nor were they referred to as Greeks by contemporary observers. Bowring's report, for example, mentioned fourteen names for which he was able to determine as being of Greek origin, but he also indicated their citizenship at the time. They were the following: S Avierino (British), I d'Anastasy (Swedish), Braggioti (Austrian), D Casdagli (Russian), P S Mavrocordatos (Greek), Prolos (Greek), G Popolani (British), A Riga Giro (British), G Scaramanga (Greek), G Sevastopoulos (Austrian), M Tossitsas (Greek Consul-General), G Vouros (Austrian), N Zaccali (Greek), S Zizinias (French). (Bowring, 1840: 80-1)

That Bowring's list of fourteen Greek merchants was incomplete is evident from the fact that he did not include the Cassavetis brothers as Greeks because they were British citizens and he was unable to determine their ethnic origin. Dimitrios and Alexander Cassavetis, however, were registered in the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate archives as residing in Alexandria since 1833, and their names appear a number of times in the records of the Greek Community of Alexandria archives. (Politis, 1930: 195) Furthermore, the prominence of the Cassavetis commercial firm was noted by the Greek traveller George Typaldos Cozakis, who indicated that in the early 1850s this firm employed over one hundred and fifty employees and had salary and administrative expenses which averaged eighteen thousand sterling per year. The firm was registered in London
and had branches throughout Egypt and the Sudan, but its headquarters were in Alexandria. (Cozakis, 1859: 51)

Another important characteristic of the prominent early Greek merchant immigrants to Alexandria was that practically all of them arrived in the city subsequent to the development of Muhammad 'Ali's economic policies, that is in the late 1810s, and originated from commercial centres which were part of the regional network of Greek merchants established during the second half of the eighteenth century. From the list of fourteen merchants provided by John Bowring, only two merchants, Avierino and Casdagli, had arrived in Egypt during the late eighteenth century, and thus did not constitute part of this network. Seven of those listed by Bowring, however, Mavrocordatos, Proios, Scaramanga, Sevastopoulos, Vouros, Zaccalis and Zizinias, originated from the island of Chios which was one of the main centres in this Greek regional commercial network. Chios, of course, was also the scene of a massacre of Greeks in 1822 by Ottoman troops subsequent to the start of the Greek revolution in 1821. (Alexandria Community Archives)

Furthermore, most of these merchants had already travelled to other commercial centres in the regional network prior to their arrival in Alexandria. Many of them had already lived and worked in such regional commercial centres as Istanbul, Marseilles, Smyrna, Trieste, and Malta. Zizinias, for example, arrived in Alexandria from Marseilles, while d'Anastasy arrived from Malta. Thus, when these merchants arrived in Alexandria they were already well connected with the regional commercial network and either possessed sufficient capital or had access to credit within this network. Later in the nineteenth century the Greek merchants arriving in Alexandria also originated from the same
commercial centres, but they also travelled to either Britain or France prior to their arrival in Egypt.

The connections already established with the regional commercial network permitted the Greek merchants in Alexandria to take advantage of new demands and price fluctuations in the Mediterranean and European commercial markets. Thus, many of these merchants were able to prosper from the cereal shortage in Europe that was caused by the Crimean War. Petros Cavafy, for example, was one of those Alexandria merchants who had access both to the regional commercial network, since he originated from Istanbul, and to the British market where he had resided for a period prior to his arrival in Alexandria. Just prior to the start of the Crimean War, Cavafy moved from Alexandria to Miniya, a cereal producing region in Upper Egypt, and established a branch of his commercial firm. Cassavetis and Nicolopoulos, also from Alexandria, moved there at the same time and thus established the first nucleus of a future Greek community. The move to Miniya proved quite profitable for all three merchants who established a virtual monopoly over cereal exports from Alexandria during and after the Crimean war period. Of course, the fact that they also held British citizenship permitted them to operate un-hindered when other Greek merchants in Alexandria suffered from the fact that Greece had supported the Russians in the war. According to Greek sources, Nicolopoulos accumulated a sufficiently large fortune that he was able to purchase the entire cereal production of southern Egypt for the year 1858-9, at a price of 180,000 sterling. (Cozakis, 1859: 51; Politis, 1930: 199)

With the arrival of the cotton boom during the 1860s, many Greek commercial firms in Alexandria were able to accumulate large fortunes within a short period of time. Furthermore, the cotton boom attracted a
large number of Greek merchants from the region who came to settle in Alexandria. During the decade of the 1860s the Greek commercial community in Alexandria expanded quite dramatically. Table 4.1 lists those firms which were established during this decade.

Table 4.1: Greek Firms Established in Alexandria During the 1860s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMODITY</th>
<th>BRANCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Schylitsi</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Zifta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negropontis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Tanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Th. Rallis</td>
<td>cotton, cereals</td>
<td>Alexandria, Mansura, Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Notaras</td>
<td>cotton, cereals</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. J Cassavetis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Tanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Choremi</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Zervoudachis</td>
<td>cotton, cereals, finance</td>
<td>Alexandria, Kafr al-Zayyat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Zaccalis</td>
<td>cotton, finance</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kindynechos</td>
<td>cotton, finance</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tamvacopoulos</td>
<td>cotton, general trade</td>
<td>Alexandria, Kafr al-Zayyat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sacillis</td>
<td>cotton, cereals</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cassulis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Kafr al-Zayyat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Salvagos</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rodochanachi</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Zaqaziq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Christodoulou</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Rigadis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Georgalis</td>
<td>cotton, general trade</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tymbas</td>
<td>cotton, general trade</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. X Constantinidis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Samanud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. C Constantinidis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. A Pringos</td>
<td>cotton, cereals</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. J Antoniadis</td>
<td>cotton, finance</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Damianos</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Revithis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Metaxopoulos</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sakelaridis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Birkat al-Sab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Pesmatzoglou</td>
<td>cotton, finance</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Agelopoulos</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. O Ioanidis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. D Ioanidis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Ioannou</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Goddaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Theodorou</td>
<td>cotton, general trade</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Averoff</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Achilopoulos</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Benakis</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Liverpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Voltos</td>
<td>cotton</td>
<td>Alexandria, Kafr al-Zayyat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Politis, 1930: 202-3

The above list is by no means a complete statement of all the Greek merchant firms operating in Alexandria during the 1860s. It includes
only those who were registered in the Greek Consular archives and specialised in cotton exporting as a primary activity. It is worth noting, however, that those firms listed above, who in addition to Alexandria also had a branch in Liverpool, were the ones which were to achieve prominence and power during the second half of the nineteenth century. Furthermore, the above table also indicates that some of the cotton exporting firms also participated in financial activities.

The financial and banking sector of the Egyptian economy started to attract larger numbers of Greek merchants from Alexandria during the second half of the nineteenth century. The reason for this is due primarily to three factors: first, as chapter three indicated, it was from the 1850s on that this sector of the economy developed rapidly; second, the vast amounts of wealth accumulated during the cotton boom period encouraged many Greek merchants to seek additional avenues where they could invest their capital; and third, during the 1840s and 1850s important developments had occurred in this field in Europe, especially in Britain and France, which had drastically transformed the European and Mediterranean financial and banking system. This last factor in particular played a significant role in the incorporation of Egypt into the global capitalist economy and the Greek merchants in Alexandria played a central role in this process. As Hossam Issa points out, "...l'histoire des groupes financiers etrangers en Egypte a ete rigoureusement parallele au development du systeme de credit et a l'evolution des droits des societes dans l'Europe Occidentale." (Issa, 1970: 35)

Britain was one of the first European countries to introduce important changes in the organisation and structure of the finance and banking sector of its economy. The Joint Stock Companies Act of 1844 was
followed by the Companies Limited by Shares Act of 1855 and culminated in the Act of 1856 which lifted all remaining restrictions on the activities of finance capital. (Issa, 1970: 35-6) The significance of these acts is that they permitted the emergence of finance companies with a specific interest in investment banking over a long term and a greater willingness to take risks overseas. This was an important break from the traditional forms of merchant banking, which as David Landes points out,

...in its higher form was more than a profession, it was a way of life. On the one hand, the considerable risks of foreign exchange, the emphasis on the slow but steady multiplication of minimal unit gain and the confidential nature of the transactions gave rise to an ethic in which cardinal values 'were' prudence, thrift and unobtrusive modesty. (Landes, 1958: 33)

The above characterisation of merchant banking is also an apt description of the early Greek merchant-financiers like Tossitsas and Zizinias. The new possibilities within the financial system in Britain, however, were immediately reflected in Egypt with the establishment of the first Joint Stock Company with limited liability and registered in London under the 1856 Act. This company was established by Khedival decree in Egypt, due to the absence of appropriate legislation, and its shares were floated entirely in the London financial market. It was called The Bank of Egypt, and was organised by a Greek from Smyrna who was also a British citizen named Paschalis. (Issa, 1970: 37) The initial capital of this bank was half a million sterling, of which half was paid up, and its operations were entirely confined to Egypt and the financing of cotton production and export. (Crouchley, 1936: 29) During the decade of the 1860s, however, the bank expanded its activities to also include the highly profitable enterprise of lending money to the Egyptian State. (Issa, 1970: 37)
Thus, the new legislation in Britain not only encouraged new forms of organising financial and banking establishments in Egypt, but it also attracted new types of Greek financiers who came to settle in Alexandria. An important characteristic of these financiers is that they were well connected with a very different commercial and financial network than were their predecessors. The network was north-west European and it permitted them both to take advantage of the new legislation in Britain and France and to have access to large sums of capital which their predecessors could never have managed to raise. These connections, of course, enabled the new Greek financiers who arrived in Alexandria to make the most of the important transformations being experienced by Egypt's economy during the decades of the 1860s and 1870s. In particular, it permitted them to participate in the most lucrative and new economic activity of lending money to the Egyptian State which had embarked on a massive project of public borrowing. As Hossam Issa points out, during the 1860s and the 1870s "...c'est la banque qui représente l'élément dominant dans la vie économique égyptienne: le commerce, les travaux publics restent sous sa dépendence." (Issa, 1970: 40)

It is interesting to note that not all of the old prominent Greek merchant firms in Alexandria failed to take advantage of the new economic realities that emerged in the 1860s. Some embarked on new alliances with European firms and were able to sustain and even improve their prominence in the city, albeit based on a new source of wealth. The Sinadinos family was one such example. Ioannis Sinadinos, who originated from Chios and was part of the regional Greek commercial network had failed to become a prominent merchant in Alexandria and did not have the necessary contacts in Britain and France in order to
participate in the new economic activities. He abandoned, therefore, the Greek commercial network and allied himself with the French Pastré brothers, who were one of the four leading merchant firms in Alexandria since the Muhammad 'Ali period. Unlike the other three leading commercial firms, Tossitsas, Zizinias and d'Anastasy, the Pastré brothers had well established contacts in France and were able to ride the tide when the economic situation in Egypt started to change in the mid-1850s. Sinadinos joined Pastré and together they established the second bank in Alexandria, The Anglo-Egyptian Banking Company, in 1864. Nevertheless, as British financial legislation was more liberal than French laws at the time, they decided to register their company in London. The bank was registered as a Joint Stock Limited Company and had an initial capital of one and a half million sterling which was raised in the London market. (Crouchley, 1936: 30; Issa, 1970: 41)

The major shareholders in this banking venture were three French and two British banks. The French banks were the Société Marsellese de Credit in Marseille, the Credit Agricole in Paris and the Credit Foncier de France in Paris. The British banks were the Agra and Masterman's Bank in London and the General Credit and Finance Company in London. (Issa, 1970: 41) The Anglo-Egyptian Banking Company

...restricted its operations to dealing with the [Egyptian] Government. In 1865 it acted as agent for a loan to Ismail...Later, it was the channel through which large blocks of shares of the Khedive's later loans were passed into French hands, acting particularly as purchasing agent for the Credit Foncier of France. (Crouchley, 1936: 30)

It is also worth noting that after the British occupation of Egypt in 1882, Sinadinos managed to evict the French capital and his partner from the company and by 1887 the bank was purely a British company. In that same year its name was changed to The Anglo-Egyptian Bank and its
capital was reduced to eight hundred thousand sterling of which only half was paid up. (Crouchley, 1936: 31; Issa, 1970: 41) Sinadinos, of course, benefited enormously from this association with the Pastré brothers. He was appointed General Director of the bank in Alexandria and remained in this post until he retired and was succeeded by another Alexandria Greek, George Ghousios. (Politis, 1930: 262) Such a position permitted Sinadinos to accomplish what he had failed to do as a merchant and part of the regional Greek commercial network. He attained wealth, status and power because the bank he managed was one of the leading financial institutions in Alexandria.

Although the bank was essentially a British and French economic enterprise, Sinadinos ensured that it played a significant supportive role in the financial affairs of other Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria. In this manner a new network of Alexandria-based Greek financiers started to emerge during the 1870s and 1880s. These financiers eventually became the prominent Greeks in the city and replaced the old mercantile aristocracy of Tossitsas, Zizinias and d'Anastasy. An important characteristic of this Greek financial oligarchy, which emerged in the 1870s, is that they had almost no connections with the regional Greek commercial network, but were closely connected with British and French capital. It is interesting, therefore, to examine the manner in which Sinadinos used the Anglo-Egyptian Bank in order to initiate and support the financial activities of this financial group of Greeks in Alexandria.

Among its other activities the Anglo-Egyptian Bank initiated the establishment of two other banks in Alexandria during the 1870s. The first was the Banque d'Alexandrie which was established in 1872 as a Joint Stock Limited Company, registered in London as a joint venture
between British capital and Greeks in Alexandria, with an initial capital of one million sterling. (Issa, 1970: 41) The Greek capital was represented by Choremis, Antoniadis, Salvagos, Negropontis, Zervoudachis and Benakis. Salvagos, however, was the largest Greek shareholder, became its first managing director, and was also responsible for the dissolution of the bank in 1884. The manner in which this financial enterprise was dissolved will be discussed in some detail in the following section of this chapter. Other Greek shareholders were Konstantinos Sinadinos, cousin of Ioannis Sinadinos who was General Manager of the Anglo-Egyptian Bank, and Vasilis Gheorghalas, both of whom were also on the board of directors, and Schylitsis, who was also an assistant director. The British capital was raised by small shareholders and was represented by an Englishman, named Richardson, who was also the Managing Director of the London branch. (Politis, 1930: 262)

It can be argued that the Banque d'Alexandrie represented the first attempt by the Greek financial oligarchy in Alexandria to establish its presence and status in the economic affairs of the city and Greek community affairs. Although relying heavily on European capital to initiate their venture, they included most of the wealthy Greek financiers in Alexandria and used this bank as the flagship of their enterprises. This is noted by a contemporary observer of the financial activities in Alexandria, Sidi Lokman al-Hakim, who states

La communauté grecque qui, à plusieurs reprises, a prouvé sa vitalité en traversant assez honorablement les grandes crises des dix années dernières, a su s'affranchir, en s'Épurant et en devenant plus solide, de la tutelle de banques... Or, nous l'avons dit, avec ces éléments d'action et de succès, le commerce grec, très considérables en Orient, ne devait pas se soumettre aisément au patronage, frisant le monopole, des banques et que les autres membres de la communauté mercantile, moins intelligents ou moins unis, n'ont eu ni la force, ni l'esprit de leur contester en créant une puissance financière à leur propre usage. Autant que possibles, les Grecs font leurs
Sidi Lokman al-Hakim, who was generally quite critical of the financial activities of Europeans in Egypt, seems to suggest that the Greek financial enterprise was meant to counter the pressures imposed upon mercantile activity in Alexandria by the European banks. His suggestion is only partially right. The Greek financial oligarchy was concerned to establish their own network in Alexandria in order to compete successfully with the older prominent Greek merchants in the city, but they had little intention of reviving the regional Greek commercial network which had acted as a base for the earlier generation. The economic forces had changed in Egypt by the early 1870s, and the Greek financiers were quite aware that finance and banking were the future sources of wealth and power. Furthermore, in order to establish their status in the city they needed their own enterprise with a certain degree of autonomy from British and French capital, but they were also unable to initiate such an enterprise without the support of European capital.

Thus, it is difficult to suggest that the Banque d'Alexandrie was established as a challenge to the supremacy of European capital in the economic affairs of the city. Nevertheless, that Sidi Lokman al-Hakim, an Egyptian nationalist, would see this venture in such a framework reflects the perception of the Greeks in Alexandria within Egyptian society. A perception, of course, which had been developed due to the activities of earlier prominent merchants like Tossitsas, Zizinias, etc. As the next section and the following chapter will indicate, this Greek financial oligarchy took advantage of the reputation and contacts of the
Greek community in Alexandria in order to facilitate the activities of European capital and thus enhance their own personal wealth. This is the context, therefore, within which the Anglo-Egyptian Bank helped establish the second bank, The Banque General, in 1879. This was also a Greek financial enterprise, whose major shareholders were Konstantinos and Themistoklis Sinadinos, and the bank was registered in London. The two Sinadinos brothers, cousins of Ioannis Sinadinos, were also its co-directors, and as with the Banque d'Alexandrie, this bank also restricted its operations to Egyptian government borrowing. (Politis, 1930: 263)

The manner in which the Anglo-Egyptian Bank contributed to the establishment of both of these Alexandria-based Greek banks indicates the extent to which these Greek financial enterprises were dependent both upon European capital and the Alexandria-based Greek financial network for their very existence and profitability. As indicated in the previous chapter, Egypt received only a part of the loans that she contracted in the European financial markets because the rest was kept to meet interest payments. The difference, therefore, had to be raised locally, and this was where small banks such as the Banque d'Alexandrie and the Banque General came in. By 1876, for example, Egypt had received only 46,140,721 sterling of the 68,497,160 sterling that she had borrowed in the European markets. Furthermore, in that same year, there was a floating debt which amounted to twenty-three million sterling. (Crouchley, 1936: 18-9)

Thus, approximately forty-five million sterling was raised from the Alexandria financial market. The Anglo-Egyptian Bank was one of the six banks that had arranged the large State loans in Europe, and thus used its influence, derived from these transactions, to ensure that the Greek
banks received a high proportion of the forty-five million sterling that was raised locally. Given the competitive nature of banking and the presence of a number of European financiers in the city of Alexandria, the role of Ioannis Sinadinos, General Manager of the Anglo-Egyptian Bank, was quite crucial in permitting these small Greek banks to be established. Sinadinos represented both European capital and the Alexandria-based Greek financial network.

The two examples presented above did not constitute the only financial activities of the Greek financiers in Alexandria, nor did they represent the only pattern employed by these financiers in enhancing their personal wealth. An example of a different pattern of organisation was the establishment of the Société Financier d'Égypte by Paschalis in 1862. Paschalis was the founder of the first modern bank in Egypt, discussed above, but was removed from the directorship of this bank in 1860. The new financial enterprise was also registered in London where its General Director was an Englishman named J Lewis Farley. Farley, who specialised in Near East banking, was also the founder of the Ottoman Financial Association, which was also registered in London, but operated in Turkey. This enterprise, however, was also associated with two other financial institutions, the Imperial and Mercantile Credit Association and the London and Mediterranean Bank, that were registered in London, but operated in Turkey and Egypt respectively. Furthermore, the London and Mediterranean Bank was itself the result of an amalgamation of another two London registered financial enterprises that had worked in Alexandria, the Landau and Company, and the Continental Bank Corporation. (Issa, 1970: 41-2) Paschalis was named General Director of the Société Financier d'Égypte in Alexandria, but it is
clear from the above that his role was to facilitate a number of British financial enterprises in their activities in Egypt.

A different area in which the Greek financiers of Alexandria employed their talents and connections was to facilitate the establishment of European mortgage banks in Alexandria. The Credit Foncier Egyptienne was the first European mortgage bank to be established in Alexandria on the 15th of February, 1880, by a Khedival decree and registered in Egypt as a Joint Stock Limited Company. (Issa, 1970: 49) The registration in Egypt was possible because the establishment of the Mixed Courts in Egypt in 1876 had introduced all the latest legislation from Europe, including financial legislation. The bank was established jointly by a group of Jewish and Greek financiers from Alexandria. The Jewish financiers included Raphael Suares and Israel Aghion and the Greek financiers were headed by Amvrosios Rallis and Konstantinos Salvagos. (Owen, 1969: 277-8) The initial capital of the bank consisted of 1,600,000 sterling which was divided into eighty thousand shares of twenty sterling each, five sterling paid up. A year later it doubled its capital by issuing another eighty thousand shares. It should be pointed out, however, that from its very establishment, this bank was controlled by three major French banks. These were the Credit Lyonnais, la Société General, and the Comptoir Nationale d'Escompte. (Issa, 1970: 49) The significance of these French banks emerged in 1891, when the Comptoir Nationale d'Escompte bought out all the other shareholders and the subsequent development of the bank was controlled from France. By 1905, it had become the leading mortgage bank in Egypt with a capital of eight million Egyptian pounds. (Crouchley, 1936: 34)

It is clear from the above that the role of Rallis and Salvagos was to facilitate the activities of French capital in Egypt. This was
particularly important given the turbulent political climate in 1880 when the bank was established. Furthermore, after the British occupation of Egypt in 1882, the role of Rallis and Salvagos, both British citizens, was also crucial in assisting this French enterprise to survive the exclusively pro-British economic policy of Lord Cromer. It appears, however, that by 1891 French capital felt sufficiently secure and powerful to dismiss its local agents and emerged as a wholly French enterprise.

The above examples should not be taken to suggest that the prominent Greek merchants in Alexandria did not participate in any financial enterprises. On the contrary, there is evidence that several of these merchants involved themselves in a number of enterprises, but with an important difference. They tended to participate in companies which specialised in the provision of services for the marketing of cotton and which were established with local capital. One such area of activity, for example, was the founding of steam-based Nile navigation companies in the 1850s whose aim was to improve the efficiency of transporting cotton from the agricultural areas to the port of Alexandria. Cassavetis, a prominent Alexandria merchant was one of the co-founders and directors of the first such company, Compagnie Egyptienne Privilegie pour la Remorquage a Vapeur sur le Nil et les Canaux de l'Egypte, which was established on the 14th of September, 1854. Nikolaos Zaccalis, another prominent Alexandria merchant, was a shareholder and director of the second Nile navigation company, The Medjidiya, which was founded on the 1st. of February, 1857, and its principal shareholder was the Khedive himself. (Politis, 1930: 279-80)

The Greek financiers were also involved in a number of other companies, but three factors distinguished them from the activities of the Greek
merchants. First, they appear to have involved themselves in these enterprises primarily for the purpose of speculation and quick profits rather than as a means of facilitating commercial activity; second, they concentrated on public utilities which provided services to the residents of Alexandria rather than for the development of Egypt's major economic sector, agriculture; and third, the companies in which they were involved were almost invariably controlled by European capital. A good example of the first factor was the establishment of The Khedive insurance company in 1873, which was entirely owned and managed by Greek financiers from Alexandria. The company was registered in Alexandria, had a capital of half a million sterling, and its three major shareholders were Choremis, Negropontis and Zervoudachis. The company director was also a Greek from Alexandria, Ioannis Lydis. This company, however, did not last very long. On the 23rd. of December, 1874, it was dissolved and the reasons for its dissolution were elaborated by one of its founders, Zervoudachis, when he noted that

*L'expérience de vingt mois que notre société vient de faire a, pensons-nous, prouve que le pays ne fournit pas, pour plusieurs raisons, assez d'objets d'assurances qui correspondent tant aux avances faites qu'a la grande responsabilité qui pese sur les actionnaires. Dernièrement surtout, les opérations de la société en matière d'assurances ont été réduites, que les primes perçues sont en grande disproportion avec les risques pendant.*

(Politis, 1930: 280)

By the end of 1874, it was already clear to most astute observers that Egypt's finances were in trouble and that the European powers would be forced to intervene in her domestic affairs. This may have suggested to the Greek financiers that an insurance company was not the safest means of accumulating wealth in a period of financial uncertainty. Furthermore, this company was the only one which the Greek financiers actually invested their own capital and registered it in Alexandria. In other words, without European backing and given the financial situation
in Egypt, the risk was too great. The company, it may be suggested, was intended as a speculative enterprise and given the conditions, it had to be dissolved quickly.

These Greek financiers were more at home participating in enterprises which had European backing and with a minimal of their own capital invested. This is clear from the following two examples of public utility service companies that were established as a result of exclusive concessions granted by the Egyptian State and capital invested by Europeans. The first was the result of a twenty-five year concession granted by Khedive Sa'id to a French engineer, Cordier, to supply fresh water to the city of Alexandria. The concession was granted in 1857, and Cordier founded the Société Civile des Eaux d'Alexandrie, which was registered in France. In 1867, Khedive Isma'il bought out the company for 8,600,000 francs and granted the exclusive and unlimited concession to Ioannis Sinadinos, who was the founder of the Anglo-Egyptian Bank. (Crouchley, 1936: 35) Sinadinos administered the concession as part of the activities of the Anglo-Egyptian Bank, but in 1879 he sold the concession to the Alexandria Water Company Ltd. which was founded in that year and registered at 36, Lincoln Inn Fields, London with a paid up capital of four hundred thousand sterling. Its shareholders, however, were all Greek financiers from Alexandria. This company was founded by Konstantinos Salvagos who was one of its major shareholders and its first President. Another major shareholder was Zervoudachis. (Crouchley, 1936: 35)

The second company was also established in order to take advantage of an unlimited concession granted to Ioannis Sinadinos in 1860 for a tramway line in Alexandria. In 1862, Sinadinos, Zizinias and Zervoudachis founded the Alexandria and Ramleh Railway Company Ltd. and registered it
in London with an initial capital of 110,000 sterling. In 1879, however, with political instability reaching near its climax, they sold the company and concession to another Greek company, Nugevitch Hotels. (Crouchley, 1936: 35; Politis, 1930: 291) By the end of the nineteenth century, the concession had been sold to another Greek company, and during the early part of the twentieth century it was re-sold twice to other Greek companies. Both these examples suggest the manner in which one Greek financier, Ioannis Sinadinos, was able to take advantage of his position as General Manager of the Anglo-Egyptian Bank to assist a number of other Greek financiers in Alexandria.

In some respects Sinadinos was the successor of Michalis Tossitsas among the Greeks in Alexandria. He was a successor, however, who relied upon finance capital in order to achieve status and wealth, and who derived his power from his close contacts with European capital. In this respect, therefore, the emergence of Sinadinos as the most prominent, powerful and wealthy Greek in Alexandria during the 1870s also reflected the fact that the primary source of wealth for the entire community had also been transformed. From a reliance on mercantile activities and the privileges received from the Egyptian State during the first half of the nineteenth century, the Greek community started to rely primarily on European capital and financial activities towards the end of the 1870s. With the arrival of the British occupation in 1882, and especially the implementation of Lord Cromer's colonial economic policies, this trend within the Greek community developed rapidly and became dominant by the end of the century. This process will be elaborated in the next section.

Prior to concluding this section, however, it is important to point out that during this period of Egyptian economic history, some of the Greek
merchants and entrepreneurs in Alexandria followed a very different path from that followed by either the merchants or the financiers, in their attempt to secure wealth and prominence. These were the few Greek entrepreneurs who initiated a number of manufacturing projects, and thus laid the foundations for the emergence of a modern industrial sector in the Egyptian economy. In general their activities were quite limited and greatly overshadowed by both the commercial and financial enterprises that dominated the economy of Alexandria during this period.

Nevertheless, in addition to contributing to the emergence of a new sector in the Egyptian economy, this group of Greek manufacturers in Alexandria also relied almost exclusively on the regional Greek commercial network and their own initiatives and capital in order to embark on these manufacturing projects. In this respect, therefore, they also constituted one of the first attempts by Egyptian and eastern Mediterranean capital to confront the developing hegemony of European capital in the area during the second half of the nineteenth century. This process, of course, did not develop into a significant force until the 1930s, and was only able to challenge European capital successfully after the Nasir revolution of 1952. Its origins, however, can be partly located in the few manufacturing enterprises initiated by some Greeks in Alexandria during the three decades prior to the British occupation of Egypt in 1882.

The manufacturers in Alexandria contributed to the establishment of five branches of the manufacturing sector during this period: cotton-ginning, paper, confectionery, leather tanning and construction. Only cotton-ginning, however, experienced any significant development and growth prior to 1882. As might be expected, the reason for its rapid growth and development was that it greatly facilitated the export of cotton to
Europe. It is not surprising, therefore, that this branch of the manufacturing sector attracted many of the prominent Greek cotton exporters in Alexandria. The first attempt to introduce mechanization in the process of ginning cotton was made in 1840, but it was unsuccessful and it was not until 1854-5 that the first mechanical gins were introduced into the Egyptian agrarian economy. These were the newly developed McCarthy gins imported by the Rallis brothers and installed in Talha, in the Delta. The twenty gins had been purchased from an English firm, Platt Brothers of Oldham, and were placed in an old palace belonging to Khedive Sa'id. As these gins had been designed for American cotton, which is shorter, the Rallis brothers were forced to adapt them and thus also contributed to the development of the first cotton-gins suited to Egyptian long staple cotton.

The introduction of mechanical cotton-ginning greatly improved the efficiency of preparing cotton for transportation and export. An Egyptian peasant required six or seven days to gin one kantar of cotton by traditional methods, while the McCarthy machine could complete the same task in ten hours. Egyptian cotton-producers were quick to realise the benefits to be derived from these machines, even though the cotton ginners were charging excessively high prices. During the late 1850s, the cotton ginners were charging seventy-seven Egyptian piasters per kantar, which enabled them to make a net return on capital of about twenty to twenty-five percent. Nevertheless,

They were not put off by the high cost, reckoning that it was worth paying, not only as a means to relieve themselves of the onerous burden of working their own primitive machines, but also because it allowed them to sell their crop immediately after it was harvested instead of having to wait until it had been ginned, thus avoiding a considerable loss of money through accumulating interest on the loan they had obtained. (Owen, 1969: 78)
Subsequent to the introduction of the first cotton gins by the Rallis brothers, several prosperous Greek cotton merchants in Alexandria also purchased their own cotton gins. An additional factor which encouraged Greek cotton merchants to buy cotton gins was the fact that a new lucrative market in cotton seeds had been established by the end of the 1850s. It has been estimated that the sale of cotton seeds augmented the total earnings of the cotton merchants by about ten percent. By the end of the 1870s, therefore, practically all the prominent Greek cotton-exporting merchants in Alexandria had their own cotton gins in some village or rural town in the Delta. This permitted these Greek merchants in Alexandria to develop a virtual monopoly over this branch of manufacturing by 1882. In Kafr al-Zayyat, for example, which was one of the major cotton trading centres in the Delta, out of a total of 280 cotton gins, the Greek merchants owned 210 or seventy-five percent. (Diakofotaki, 1973: 21; Paleologhos, 1953: 147; Politis, 1930: 312)

After the British occupation of Egypt in 1882, and the increased demand for high quality Egyptian cotton in Britain, this branch of manufacturing experienced substantial growth and so did the participation of the Greeks.

In distinct contrast to cotton ginning, the other four branches of manufacturing attracted Greek entrepreneurs from Alexandria who had limited involvement in commercial or financial activities in the city. Ioannis Laghoudakis, for example, arrived in Alexandria in 1877, after he had spent a year in Cairo, and began the first stages of paper manufacturing. At that stage, he was the first person to import cigarette paper in large rolls from Europe, cut it into the appropriate size for rolling a cigarette and sold it in the villages in the Delta. His primitive workshop, however, was destroyed in the events of 1882,
and with the compensation he received he was able to purchase appropriate machinery from Europe in order to produce cigarette paper and later other types of paper in Alexandria. Another branch of manufacturing in which the Alexandria Greeks made a pioneering contribution was that of food production. The first mechanized production of confectionery was founded by Christos Soleas in Alexandria in 1875. Soleas expanded his activities so that by the turn of the century he was one of major exporters of confectionery. In 1905, for example, he exported twenty thousand kilograms of loukoumi (Turkish Delight) to Britain. In 1876, Tornazakis established the second mechanized confectionery factory in Alexandria and in 1880, Pandelis Theodosiou founded the third. (Paleologhos, 1953: 128-9; Politis, 1930: 392-3) By 1882, therefore, these three Greeks in Alexandria had a monopoly over mechanized production of confectionery; and this virtual monopoly in this branch of manufacturing continued through to the 1950s.

Another branch of manufacturing in which the Greeks in Alexandria played a pioneering role was that of leather tanning. The first such factory was founded in Alexandria by the Charalambos brothers and Odyseas Bolonachis in 1850. Leather tanning, of course, had existed in Egypt and there was a state-owned factory in Alexandria which produced leather for the Egyptian army and employed manual means in the tanning process. The importance of the Bolonachis factory derived from the fact that it introduced for the first time in Egypt steam-run machines for the tanning process, and produced high quality leather for the consumer market in Alexandria. In 1870, both factories were re-located to the outskirts of Alexandria for ecological and health reasons, but the Bolonachis factory was already larger than the state-owned enterprise. Bolonachis employed between three hundred and four hundred workers
compared with the one hundred employed in the state-owned factory. Furthermore, the state-owned tanned hides cost more than those imported from Europe, while Bolonachis' tanned hides were considerably cheaper. This permitted Bolonachis almost to corner the Alexandria market for shoe-soles. Given the competition, the state rented its factory to another Greek from Alexandria, Caloutas, who reorganised the production process, imported steam-run machines and increased the labour force to three hundred. Between them the two factories were able to satisfy the bulk of the Egyptian market in 1880, and even export to such countries as Bulgaria, Rumania, Russia and Turkey. By 1882, four more leather tanning factories had been established in the same area on the outskirts of Alexandria. One of these was owned by another Greek from Alexandria, Savas Vasiliadis, and the remaining three by Egyptian entrepreneurs, Mustafa Rabi'a, 'Abd al-'Azziz 'Attar and Muhammad 'Abassi. (Paleologhos, 1953: 208; Politis, 1930: 304)

The last branch of manufacturing in which the Alexandria Greeks played a pioneering role during this period was that of building. One of the oldest construction firms to be established in Egypt was that of George Zouros, which was founded in Alexandria in 1850. Its primary concern at first was ship-building and had been established as a partnership between Zouros, who was from the island of Chios, and his two brothers-in-law, Pandelis Trehakis from Chios and Themistoklis Sarris from the island of Siros. Chios and Siros, Greek islands in the Aegean, were well known in the Mediterranean region for their ship-building industries since the eighteenth century. During the 1860s, the reign of Khedive Isma'il and the start of the grandiose state projects, Zouros abandoned the partnership and established his own construction firm in Alexandria. Zouros, who was a personal friend of Khedive Isma'il was
able to secure a number of state contracts to construct public works during the boom years of 1863 to 1879. Among these projects were several palaces for Khedive Isma'il and many of the new apartment buildings in Alexandria. By 1882, the Zouros construction firm was the largest in Alexandria. (Paleologhos, 1953: 234)

In addition to construction, the Greeks in Alexandria also pioneered in the area of marble-cutting that was to be used in buildings. In 1872, Stavros Michailidis established the first factory in Alexandria that used steam-powered tools for cutting, shaping and polishing marble. Michailidis held the monopoly in marble-based buildings and among his accomplishments in Alexandria was the Salamlik Royal Palace at Ras al-Tin, which was constructed entirely from imported Italian marble, and is to the present day the most outstanding architectural landmark in the city. The Michailidis firm, which maintained its monopoly in Alexandria until the 1930s, also achieved a regional reputation. For instance among its accomplishments was the construction of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem. (Paleologhos, 1953: 202-3)

It should be noted that those Greeks who contributed to the development of the above branches of manufacturing, except cotton-ginning, arrived in Alexandria with particular skills and employed them in providing certain services to the rapidly expanding European population in that city. In this respect they took advantage of the growing prosperity and the newly developed bourgeois patterns of consumption and life-styles in order to improve their personal economic status. Nevertheless, by contributing to the establishment of an indigenous manufacturing sector, they contributed to the implantation of the first seeds of Egyptian industrial capitalism which developed rapidly after the 1919 revolution and especially during the 1930s. (Deeb, 1976; Tignor, 1966 & 1976)
Thus, although it was Greek immigrants to Alexandria who pioneered industrial growth in Alexandria, this process contributed to the emergence an Egyptian nationalist political movement, during the first half of the twentieth century, which succeeded in challenging the hegemony of European capital with the Nasir revolution of 1952. Ironically, the Greek capitalist descendants of these early pioneers in Alexandria were also considered Europeans by then, and thus had their enterprises and firms nationalised in the 1950s.

This account has shown that the economic activities of these Greek entrepreneurs played a dual and contradictory role with regard to the primary force that characterised the Egyptian economy during this period; the increasing hegemony of European capital in Egyptian economic and political affairs. The mercantile activities of the early Greek immigrants played a central role in Egypt's integration into the international division of labour as a producer of a single agricultural commodity, but also constituted an obstacle which European capital had to overcome in order to establish its hegemony in that country. Similarly, the bourgeois life-styles and consumption patterns of the Greek commercial and financial elites in Alexandria contributed to the increasing hegemony of western culture and norms, but they also encouraged the development of an indigenous manufacturing sector which later gave birth to an Egyptian nationalist movement. In sum, we may conclude that the economic activities of the Greeks in Alexandria during this period exemplified both the major trends in Egyptian economic transformation and the central contradictions inherent in these transformations.
III. Monopoly and Industrial Capital, 1882 - 1900

The previous section generalised the fact that the economic role of the Greeks in Alexandria was characterised both by diversity and uniformity; it was evident in most of the sectors of the Egyptian economy and in general contributed to the developing hegemony of European capital. The British military occupation of Egypt in 1882, however, was a decisive factor in consolidating the hegemony of British capital, and thus played a central role in enhancing the power and status of the Greek financial oligarchy in Alexandria. Nevertheless, as chapter three has indicated, cotton production and export continued to constitute the major economic activity in Egyptian society, even after the British occupation. Greek merchants in Alexandria, therefore, may have lost some of their privileges and experienced a change in their status, but they continued to play a leading role in the field of cotton exports through to the end of the nineteenth century. This is clear from the table below, where the majority of the leading cotton-exporting firms in Alexandria at the end of the nineteenth century remained Greek. Thirteen of the firms listed below were wholly Greek, and another two, Anglo-Egyptian Bank and National Bank of Egypt, had a considerable Greek participation.

**Table 4.2: Leading Cotton-Exporting Firms in Alexandria, 1900**

| 5. Salvagos and Company                 | 17. O & R Lindemann             |
| 7. Pilavachis and Company               | 19. Peel and Company            |
| 8. Andritsakis                          | 20. H Bindernagel               |
| 10. Ionian Bank                         | 22. Duckworth and Company       |
| 12. Rodocanakis and Company             | Source: Saktouris, 1915: 512    |
In the preceding table, the first fifteen firms listed were either Greek or had a considerable Greek participation. The most important of these fifteen firms, and the leading firm in the whole of Alexandria, was that of Choremi-Benakis, which was followed in importance by three European firms, Lindemann, Carver and Peel, and which were followed in turn by the other Greek and European firms. Given the significance of the Choremi-Benakis firm, it is important to present some details regarding its foundation and development.

The firm was originally founded at the height of the cotton boom period in Egypt as a branch of the Hall and Mellor Company which had been established in Liverpool in 1853. Ioannis Choremis, who had been a resident of Liverpool since 1848, joined the Hall and Mellor firm as it was about to be dissolved. After its dissolution he formed a new partnership with Mellor and departed for Alexandria where he founded the Choremi-Mellor and Company firm in 1864. The firm benefited from the cotton boom, but in particular it was able to take advantage of the considerable speculation in cotton prices that occurred during the three years from 1870 to 1873, and thus made large profits. The ability of the firm to exploit the price speculation derived from the fact that by 1870 the firm had already established a branch in the Egyptian Delta town of Mansura, under the direction of Choremis' son, Michalis. This permitted the firm to purchase cotton directly from the producers at prices which allowed them to take advantage of the sudden fluctuations in the London cotton exchange.

In 1876, Mellor resigned and Benakis joined the firm as a partner, which was then re-named the Choremi-Benakis company. The firm continued to expand and in 1886, with financial assistance from another Greek enterprise, the Bank of Alexandria, it was able to establish a new
branch which specialised in cotton trade within Egypt. This development, which also included the establishment of a number of cotton gins and presses throughout the Delta, proved quite profitable for the firm. The new branch enabled them to purchase directly from the producers and thus bypass the other Greek petty-merchants who operated as intermediaries between the Egyptian producers and the European exporting firms in Alexandria. In this respect the Choremi-Benakis firm was unique among the cotton-exporting firms in Alexandria. It was this development which permitted the firm to become the leading exporter of Egyptian cotton and to establish branches in Austria, Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Spain and Switzerland. In addition to exporting cotton regularly to these countries, the firm also exported occasionally to India and Japan. (Alexandria Community Archives; Politis, 1930: 237)

Although the Choremi-Benakis firm was originally founded in Alexandria in 1864, albeit as Choremi-Mellor, it has been discussed in this section of the chapter because of the establishment of its specialised branch in 1886, which exemplified an important characteristic of the period 1882 to 1900. Although cotton cultivation and exports continued to increase substantially during this period, the number of cotton-exporting firms was reduced considerably. As Roger Owen points out, "...a very large proportion of the business of cotton export was in the hands of relatively old firms, and it was their own internal expansion, not the establishment of new houses, which allowed the great increase in the trade in the 1890s." (Owen, 1969: 221) In other words, there was a development towards an oligopolistic situation by the established firms and the activities of the Choremi-Benakis firm exemplified this process. In fact, the Greek merchants in Alexandria founded only four new cotton-exporting firms during these two decades. These were the firms
established by Ioannis Laghonikos, George Pilavachis, Miniakis and Pavlos Rodocanakis.

The Greek cotton exporting firms in Alexandria may not have increased during this period, but the Greek cotton-exporters were able to maintain their leading role in this sector of the Egyptian economy. This was not derived solely, however, from their control of the majority of the cotton-exporting firms in Alexandria. It was primarily due to the rapid expansion of a few Greek firms and their oligopolistic control over cotton exports. This process, which reflected the primary tendency within the Egyptian economy during this period, was exemplified by the formation for the first time of an institutionalised cartel of cotton-exporting firms, the Alexandria General Produce Association, which was established on the 24th of February, 1883. This association which was initially called the Association Cottoniere d'Alexandrie, was established only a few months after the British military occupation of Egypt, and initiated a radical change in the process of exporting cotton from Alexandria.

Although Alexandria had had the first cotton futures market in the world, organized under the auspices of the Société Anonyme de la Bourse, established in 1861, the vast expansion of sales during the American Civil War was not accompanied by any further effort to provide rules for the conduct of trade. And until the 1880s, the two essentials of a large-scale commodity market were missing: a method of grading so that goods could be recognised and described with certainty without actually being inspected, and a means of arbitrating disputes. The first steps to improve this situation were taken in February 1883 when a meeting of merchants and brokers decided to form an Association Cottoniere d'Alexandrie to draw up the necessary regulations...The Association established standard grades, it laid down the premium to be paid for cotton above and below those grades, and it decided differences concerning future contracts. It also acted as the governing body of a second institution, the Société Egyptienne de la Bourse Commerciale de Minet-al-Bassal, the company established in 1884 which owned the building in which all spot sales of cotton took place. (Owen, 1969: 225)
The meeting to establish the association was arranged by the Anglo-Egyptian Bank, in which Greek interests were well represented, and the twenty-four Alexandria merchants and brokers met in its offices. Of the twenty-four persons who met, fifteen were Greek merchants and brokers from Alexandria and among them were the ten most important Greek cotton-exporters in 1883. They were the following, listed in order of importance: Emmanuil Benakis, Theodoros Rallis, Theodoros Sinadinos, Konstantinos Salvagos, Konstantinos Rodocanakis, Geogaras, Ioannis Ghousios, Konstantinos Sinadinos, Ioannis Pesmatzoghlou, and Casaneras. At the meeting, Theodoros Rallis was elected President of the Association and Emmanuil Benakis was elected Vice-President. (Politis, 1930: 212-3)

This was the first time that the prominent Greek cotton-exporters in Alexandria had organised themselves into a cartel and effectively institutionalised their control over the cotton-export sector of the Egyptian economy. This was accomplished by the association taking responsibilities for determining quality, setting prices, etc, and thus effectively determining the developments in this sector of the economy. Of course, given the significance of cotton exports, both in the export sector and the economy as a whole, these few Greeks were also effectively in a position to influence developments and transformations in the whole of Egypt.

The previous chapter, however, indicated that Lord Cromer's economic policy for improving Egypt's finances consisted essentially of an effort to increase the value of Egyptian exports. This, of course, necessitated an increase in the value of cotton exports, which in turn required that Lancashire would also increase its imports of Egyptian cotton. Lancashire, however, required high quality and reasonable
prices. It is in this context, therefore, that the establishment of this association achieves an additional significance. It permitted British capital to institutionalise its control over the Egyptian economy, albeit via the mediation of the Greek cotton-exporters who used the association to impose Lancashire-approved quality and prices on Egyptian cotton exports. Thus, "the essentials of a large-scale commodity market", as Roger Owen characterised the establishment of this association, effectively permitted both the few prominent Greek cotton-exporters in Alexandria and Lancashire firms to institutionalise their monopolistic control over the Egyptian economy. In this respect these Greek merchants in Alexandria acted, albeit inadvertently, as agents of British capital in Egypt. Similar situations also developed in other areas of the Egyptian economy.

Greek merchants in Alexandria did not however restrict their commercial activities to cotton exports. Since the era of Muhammad 'Ali, Greek merchants were involved in both the export and import of a number of commodities. With the increasing monopolisation of the cotton-export sector by a few prominent firms, many of the Greek merchants turned to other commodities, which in effect meant that they also were forced to specialise in imports. The import of tobacco for the developing cigarette industry was one such area in which the Greek merchants in Alexandria held a virtual monopoly. During the last two decades of the nineteenth century there were twenty-nine Greek firms in Alexandria which specialised in this branch of the import sector. (Politis, 1930: 232) As indicated in the previous chapter, however, Lord Cromer, also used the policy of imposing high import duties on consumer goods as a means of increasing state revenue and thus ensuring the payment of dividends to the European bondholders. It is of some interest,
therefore, to examine the manner in which tobacco imports contributed to this policy.

Up to 1883, tobacco had been cultivated on a considerable scale and used predominantly for consumption within Egypt. In that year, however, Lord Cromer issued a decree restricting the area of tobacco cultivation to fifteen hundred feddans. This was justified in terms of the inferior quality of Egyptian tobacco and that since cotton was Egypt's major export crop, it should be given preference. What Cromer neglected was the fact that there was already a thriving cigarette industry in Egypt in 1883, controlled by Greeks in Cairo, and that this restriction would adversely affect its ability to develop further. The effect of Cromer's edict was that the Greek cigarette manufacturers in Cairo had to rely on Greek merchants in Alexandria to import tobacco from Greece and Turkey.

The following year, however, Greece signed its first commercial treaty with Egypt. The then Greek Prime Minister, Tricoupis, known for his pro-British attitudes, did not consider the fact that Egypt was not a sovereign state, as it was still nominally an Ottoman province, and was thus not entitled to sign commercial treaties. Cromer, of course, de facto master of Egypt, and primarily concerned to increase Egyptian state revenue, had no objections to the implicit infringement of Ottoman rights and jurisdiction. The main element in this treaty involved the regulation of tobacco exports from Greece to Egypt. Specifically, the agreement stipulated that all tobacco shipments from Greece would have to be inspected by Egyptian customs officials. This was another infringement of contemporary legal procedures as the Capitulations specifically denied the right to Egyptian customs officials to inspect goods imported from a country which was a signatory. Greece, of course, was one of these countries. Furthermore, the agreement stipulated that
a duty of five piasters per oke would be levied. Simultaneously, Cromer increased the tax on Egyptian produced tobacco from three to twelve piasters per oke. It is clear from these measures that Cromer was primarily concerned to increase state revenue, and found that imposing duties on imported tobacco which could be inspected was easier than raising taxes from tobacco that was grown in Egypt. (Oddi, 1911: 76)

Thus, along with the Greek merchants in Alexandria, and the Greek tobacco producers in Greece, the net beneficiary of these policies was the Egyptian Treasury which derived large revenues from the duties on the import of tobacco. The Greek cigarette industry in Cairo was the main loser. Nevertheless, Egyptian peasants who had cultivated tobacco ignored Cromer's edict for a number of years and continued to grow it illegally. This illegal cultivation was further extended, when in 1887, Cromer increased the duties on tobacco imported from Greece from five piasters to twelve piasters per oke. Cromer justified this new policy in terms of satisfying the Ottoman authorities, since Egypt was nominally an Ottoman province, who had complained that the Greek merchants in Alexandria preferred to import tobacco from Greece rather than Turkey; up to 1887, Greek and Turkish tobacco had the same customs duty levied on them. (Oddi, 1911: 74)

Finally, the cultivation of tobacco was prohibited in 1890. The reason for this step was fiscal. It was desired to impose a higher duty on tobacco. This meant that it was necessary either to impose a high tax on land cultivated with tobacco, an operation which would have required constant supervision of all the cultivated land in the country - or prohibit entirely its cultivation...The receipts from the tax on imported tobacco have since become one of the most important items on the revenue side of the budget. (Crouchley, 1938: 168-9)

At the same time that tobacco cultivation was banned in Egypt, Cromer also banned all imports of Greek tobacco. This constituted direct political pressure on Greece which had just undergone an election on the
14th of October, 1890, and Tricoupis had been replaced by Theodoros Delighianis, who was openly anti-British. The political significance of Cromer's decision to ban Greek tobacco imports is quite evident when it is noted that they constituted over seventy percent of all Greek exports to Egypt. Furthermore, this act affected adversely both the Greek merchants in Alexandria and the Greek cigarette producers in Cairo. On the 31st of March, 1891, a Greek newspaper in Alexandria, Tilegrafos, stated that "...the banning of the importation of Greek tobacco in Egypt has wounded directly the Greek tobacco merchants and cigarette producers in Egypt and the tobacco producing regions in Greece." (Tilegrafos, 1891)

The newspaper went to criticise the Tricoupis government for the commercial treaty that it had signed and noted that if it had not been for that treaty, British officials could not have taken the unilateral act of banning Greek tobacco exports to Egypt. As, Greek merchants in Alexandria were entitled to benefit from the Capitulations which permitted them to import goods from any country they chose. Tobacco imports and cultivation were obviously being used by Lord Cromer as a tool of regional British policy rather than as a means of developing the Egyptian economy. This is further substantiated by the fact that on the 27th of April, 1894, Greek tobacco imports were once again permitted to arrive in Egypt; after the Delighianis government had tempered its anti-British politics. (Oddi, 1911: 78) It also underlines the fact that tobacco imports were an important asset to the Egyptian state revenue. The importance of custom duties levied on imported tobacco can be grasped from the following table.
Table 4.3: Revenue from Tobacco Duties, 1884 - 1900
(As a percentage of total revenue from custom duties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Figures produced from tables in Department of General Statistics, 1910: 405-26

The above discussion suggests the manner in which Lord Cromer manipulated aspects of Egypt's economy to suit the interests of both British capital and policy in the Eastern Mediterranean. Nevertheless, what also emerges from the above discussion is that the Greek merchants in Alexandria, who had a virtual monopoly over tobacco imports during this period, also benefited from these policies. This particular role played by the Greeks in Alexandria of inadvertently, at least, acting as agents of British interests during the last two decades of the nineteenth century was most obvious in another sector of the Egyptian economy. This was the rapid growth of Joint Stock Companies; such companies being the main conduit of foreign capital into Egypt during this period.

During the period 1882 to 1900, there were sixty-seven Joint Stock Companies formed in Alexandria, and the Greek financiers in that city played a central role in a number of these companies. In order to appreciate their relative contribution to the growth of this sector of the Egyptian economy, the various types of companies in which the Greeks
were involved will be discussed in the following order: mortgage, banks, rural and urban development, transportation and industrial.

**Mortgage Companies:**

The rapid expansion of cotton cultivation during this period only served to increase the demand for credit by the numerous Egyptian cultivators of this crop. Village-based usurers, predominantly Greek petty-merchants, had traditionally met this demand, but during this period European mortgage companies emerged as the primary source of rural credit. The **Credit Foncier d'Egypte** and the **Land and Mortgage Company of Egypt** were the only two companies to operate in Egypt during this period. It was the Credit Foncier d'Egypte, however, which took the major share of the rural credit facilities and by 1891, this company was the fifth largest landowner in Egypt. The company, which was established with the participation of two Greek financiers from Alexandria, Rallis and Salvagos, continued to expand and by 1902 it controlled eighty per cent of all the capital invested in mortgage companies in Egypt. (Crouchley, 1936: 34 & 44) As indicated in the previous section, however, French capital replaced all other shareholders in 1891, and the Greek role continued only in an administrative capacity. In this respect, therefore, it is possible to suggest that the role of the two Greek financiers was to assist European capital in establishing a monopolistic control over rural credit, even though this meant that Greek village-based petty-merchants suffered in the consequence. Of course, Rallis and Salvagos benefited from their participation in this enterprise, and especially Salvagos, who continued in an administrative capacity after the French take-over in 1891. This role improved his status, wealth and power in Alexandria and permitted
him to play a leading role in the affairs of the Greek community in Alexandria.

Banks and Finance Companies:

After the Greek financiers in Alexandria lost control over the Credit Foncier d'Egypte in 1891, they did not remain on the periphery of the rural credit business. Their involvement in the Credit Foncier taught them the benefits that could be derived from large financial institutions and they embarked upon a new project. They took advantage of the fact that the two mortgage companies operating in Egypt at the time dealt primarily with large land-owners and decided to establish a bank that would focus on the small peasant producer who was still at the mercy of the village usurer. The "...minimum loan of the Credit Foncier was fixed at L E 200" (Crouchley, 1936: 54) which was far above what was required by the vast majority of peasant producers. These small landowners, with five feddans or less, represented eighty-two percent of all landowners in 1899, and constituted the primary clientele of the village usurers. It was in this context that the Egyptian government, Lord Cromer, responded favourably to a proposal put forward by five financiers in Alexandria. The five financiers, four Greeks and one Jew, were headed by Konstantinos Salvagos and included Zervoudachis, Benakis, Rallis and Suares. It was Rallis, Salvagos and Suares, of course, who had contributed to the establishment of the Credit Foncier.

The proposed project involved the establishment of an Egyptian bank that would also act as a mortgage company, lending primarily to small landowners. It was presented to the Egyptian Prime Minister, Nubar Pasha, by Salvagos. Furthermore, Salvagos requested the assistance of the Egyptian government in the establishment of the project, due to the
high risk and limited profit involved in supplying credit to such a category of landowners. The limited profit was due to the fact that interest was legally limited to nine percent and most of the small landowners required only small amounts of credit, ten to twenty Egyptian pounds, for a short period of time, usually six months. Thus, the average interest per loan would not exceed one Egyptian pound, and this would have increased the administrative expenses enormously given that there would be thousands of such small loans.

The Egyptian government decided to support the project and the National Bank of Egypt was founded in 1898. It was registered as an Egyptian company, but the shares were controlled entirely by three non-Egyptians. The founding constitution, which was approved on the 9th of June, 1898 in the offices of Salvagos, indicates that the one hundred thousand founding shares were divided as follows: Sir E Cassel, representing a group of London financiers, received fifty thousand, Salvagos received twenty-five thousand and Suaires received the remaining twenty-five thousand. (Politis, 1930: 264) As to the government support, it consisted of the following. First, the status of the bank was immediately enhanced in the Egyptian economy by the fact that "the new bank was granted a monopoly of the privilege of issue of bank-notes 'for the entire duration of the company' fixed at fifty years." (Crouchley, 1936: 32) This was in addition to granting the bank the privilege of being the sole banker to the Egyptian Ministry of Finance and various other government departments.

Second, with regard to mortgage activities, "the bank was guaranteed against loss by the Government, and to reduce expenses, the Government 'sarrafin' [tax-collectors] were employed to supervise and collect these payments from the borrowers." (Crouchley, 1936: 32) The support
provided by the Egyptian government played a major role in enhancing the bank's activities in the mortgage field. In the first year of its operations, the bank made 870 small loans totalling twenty-seven million Egyptian pounds, but the following year the number of small loans had increased to nine and a half thousand and totalled one hundred and thirty-eight million Egyptian pounds. (Crouchley, 1936: 55) From the above figures it is possible to conclude that the average loan in the first year was thirty-one Egyptian pounds, while in the second year it had dropped to fourteen and a half Egyptian pounds. This would suggest that the bank fulfilled its objectives and concentrated on providing credit to small peasant producers. In other words, the Greek financiers in Alexandria monopolised small-scale rural credit and in doing so also permitted British capital, via Sir Cassel, to enter an area of the Egyptian economy that up to then it had failed to penetrate due to the activities of the Greek petty-merchants. Furthermore, this project which allowed British capital to increase its hegemonic control over the Egyptian economy was accomplished with Egyptian government support. In this respect the Greek financiers in Alexandria acted as direct agents for the activities of British capital in Egypt, and also played a prominent role in the development of monopolistic tendencies within the economy.

The above mentioned activities of the Greek financiers in Alexandria were not the sole financial activities of the Greeks. As the status, wealth and power of the financial oligarchy increased due to their involvement in financial enterprises with European participation, the Greek merchants of the city decided to challenge them. On the 1st of September, 1896, the Greek merchants in Alexandria contributed to the establishment of their first bank during this period. The Banque
d'Athenes, which was a subsidiary of the Bank of Athens, which had been founded in Greece in 1893, was established after it took over the private firm of Ioannis Pesmatzoglou. Pesmatzoglou, who originated from Smyrna, was the protege of George Averoff, the leading Greek merchant in Alexandria during this period. Averoff had contributed to the establishment of Pesmatzoglou's firm, and it was he who sent him to Athens to arrange for the take-over of his firm by the Bank of Athens. This bank was entirely Greek, including all its staff, and its first three directors were Pesmatzoglou himself, Fotiadis and Ioanidis. It was not until 1914, that the Greek financiers in Alexandria, Salvagos, Sinadinos, Zervoudachis, etc., were able to get on the board of directors of this bank. At that time, a number of other Europeans were also admitted to the board and the bank thus ceased to be a Greek enterprise. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that one of the first acts of the new board in 1914 was to close all the sub-branches of the bank in the various rural towns in Egypt in order to avoid competition with the activities of the National Bank of Egypt. Thus, the attempt by the Greek merchants in Alexandria to challenge both the increasing hegemony of the Greek financiers and their partners, European capital, and the monopolistic tendencies within the economy, proved futile. The Egyptian economy came under the exclusive control of monopolistic European capital, during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, and thus the era of prosperity and power for the Greek merchants in Alexandria also ended.

From the above discussion it may be concluded that the Greek financiers in Alexandria played a prominent role in this sector of the Egyptian economy and in particular contributed to the important structural changes experienced during these two decades. This role, of course,
permitted them to achieve considerable wealth, status and power within the community and by the end of the century they were able to challenge successfully the hegemony over community affairs that had been previously held by the Greek merchants.

Rural and Urban Development Companies:

As a result of the considerable interest in irrigation expressed by the British advisors to the Egyptian government, and backed by Lord Cromer, many such projects were undertaken during this period. Although these projects were all initiated by the Egyptian government, in the majority of the cases the capital was either raised through loans from European banks or locally by various financiers. An example of the latter was the construction of the Nubariyya Canal, south of Alexandria, which was initiated in 1884, at an estimated cost of sixty thousand Egyptian pounds. The total sum was raised by one Greek financier from Alexandria, Konstantinos Zervoudachis, who also undertook to finance the construction of a railway linking the canal to Kafr al-Dawar in the Delta province of Bahaira. These projects were undertaken by the Irrigation Company of Behera, which had been established in 1881 with the purpose of dredging old canals and constructing new ones. Its president was Konstantinos Zervoudachis. (Politis, 1930: 281) Such irrigation works, however,

...made it possible for big areas which had hitherto lain on the fringe of cultivation, to be brought under intensive cultivation. In most cases, however, heavy preliminary expenses had to be undertaken to supply irrigation and drainage facilities. This work fell naturally into the province of joint-stock enterprises, and a number of companies were formed to purchase large estates, to undertake the necessary work of development, to divide the land into small lots, and to sell them, usually on credit to the Egyptian farmers. In this work, more than in any other kind of enterprise, local capital was willing to participate. (Crouchley, 1936: 40)
For the above reason, the Irrigation Company of Behera was reconstituted in 1894, and "...asked for and received permission to change its purpose to that of land reclamation." (Owen, 1969: 281) The company was re-named Société Anonyme de Behera and its new president was another Greek financier in Alexandria, Konstantinos Salvagos. In that same year the company was allocated one hundred thousand feddans in the province of Bahaira for the purpose of reclamation and cultivation. By 1902, this Greek owned and managed, but Egyptian registered company, had a capital of 494,000 Egyptian pounds. After the death of Salvagos, the company was taken over by his son, Michalis, who expanded its operations, so that by 1930, it had a capital of 672,580 Egyptian pounds. (Crouchley, 1936: 45; Politis, 1930, 281 & 320)

In addition to rural development, the Greek financiers in Alexandria were also involved in various projects of urban development. "The growing population in the towns, especially in Alexandria, had been evidenced, from the middle of the century, by a number of building companies formed by local European residents with the object of providing suitable business and residential premises." (Crouchley, 1936: 41) One such company was that founded by George Zouros in 1850. In 1884, he reconstituted this privately owned company into a Joint Stock Company, the Société Anonyme des Immeubles d'Egypte, which was registered in Egypt and had an initial capital of 240,000 sterling. (Politis, 1930: 336) It was one of the most important construction firms in Alexandria, as it built all the new buildings on Muhammad 'Ali square, Sharif street, and Sesostris street, which constituted the commercial, financial and residential heart of the city. (Politis, 1930: 57)
In addition to Zouros' company, there were a number of other Greek-owned construction firms in Alexandria during this period, established as Joint Stock Companies, but none of them achieved the same prominence. The main competition for Zouros came from two privately owned Greek construction firms. The first firm of N G Nicolaou was founded in 1891, six months after he had arrived in Alexandria, with the cooperation of a Greek builder, Calliadis, who had been resident in the city for a number of years. The most important project undertaken by this firm was worth two million Egyptian pounds, and involved the construction of 250 residential buildings on the outskirts of Alexandria, from Ibrahimiyya to San Stefano. These were intended to absorb the increasing number of Europeans who arrived in the city during this period, and thus they were constructed to European specifications. The firm used Greek marble in the construction of these houses, and thereby initiated a new trend in the construction of residential accommodation in Alexandria. The firm also undertook a number of government projects in Alexandria, such as the petrol reservoirs at the port, two government secondary schools (named Isma'il and Sa'id), a government maternity hospital, and various buildings for the largest Egyptian charitable society, 'Urwa al-Withqa. The second firm was owned by N Paraskevas, which specialised in factories and warehouses. Construction, however, was one of the fields which attracted many Greek emigrating to Alexandria during this period. Most of them established privately-owned small firms which never achieved any significant position in this sector of the economy. Collectively, however, these small firms permitted the Greeks to dominate this sector. The 1897 census, for example, listed 282 privately-owned construction enterprises for the whole of Egypt, out of...
which 101, or thirty-six percent, were owned by Greeks in Alexandria. (quoted in Politis, 1930: 67)

It may be concluded from the above that the Greeks in Alexandria made a considerable contribution to this sector of the Egyptian economy. By 1902, for example, the Egyptian registered Joint Stock Companies in this sector had a combined capital of 1,242,000 Egyptian pounds of which 754,000 Egyptian pounds, or approximately two thirds, belonged to the two Greek-owned companies mentioned above. (Crouchley, 1936: 45) It should also be pointed out that since the other five companies included in the above figure operated in other cities, the Greek companies represented one hundred percent of this sector in Alexandria. Furthermore, what is interesting about the Greek participation in this sector of the economy is that the Greek financiers, especially Konstantinos Salvagos, invested their own capital in Egyptian registered companies. Of course, these were companies which could not fail, given the type of activity in which they were involved. Lord Cromer had placed irrigation works at the top of his economic agenda, and the influx of foreigners was such that accommodation was needed urgently in Alexandria. Thus, both the Société Anonyme de Behera and the Société Anonyme des Immeubles d'Egypte did not encourage the growth of European capital in this sector of the Egyptian economy, but they did contribute both to the realisation of Cromer's economic policies and the continued attraction of foreigners to Alexandria. In this respect, therefore, once again the economic role of the Greeks in Alexandria reflected the inherent contradictions developing within Egyptian society. The development of indigenous capital facilitated, in the first instance, European hegemony in Egypt, but at the same time contributed to the development of a contradictory process.
Transportation Companies:

During this period the Greeks in Alexandria were involved in two branches of this sector of the economy, railways and urban tramways. With regard to the first, their participation was through Sinadinos who had been granted a concession for the construction and running of railways around the town of Mansura in the Delta. Sinadinos established the Société Anonyme des Chemins de Fer de la Basse-Egypte in 1896, with a capital of 308,600 Egyptian pounds, all of which was raised from Belgian financiers. (Crouchley, 1936: 37) The only other Greek contribution to this branch of the transportation sector consisted of the work of a Greek engineer from Alexandria, Leonidas Iconomopoulos, who was appointed General Architect of the Egyptian Railways in 1891. During his tenure, which lasted until 1910, he organised and designed the distribution of railway stations and the railway network throughout Egypt. One of his outstanding contributions was the construction of the main railway station in Alexandria, Ramleh Station, for which he received a number of international awards. (Alexandria Community Archives)

With regard to the urban tramways branch of this sector, the Greeks participated in it through the concessions that they had obtained from the Egyptian government. In Alexandria there were two Joint Stock Companies that operated during this period. The British-owned Alexandria and Ramleh Railway Company Ltd., founded in 1862 by Sinadinos, Zizinias and Zervoudachis, and its only competitor, the Belgian-owned Tramways d'Alexandrie, which was founded by Konstantinos Salvagos in 1897, with a capital of 396,011 Egyptian pounds. (Politis, 1930: 283) In both these companies, the Greek financiers had received the concessions which then enabled European capital to establish itself
in this branch of the Egyptian economy. In return they were appointed as directors in these companies and received substantial fees for their services. (Tsirkas, 1973: 126) Thus, in this sector of the Egyptian economy, it was the Greek financial oligarchy of Alexandria who were dominant.

Industrial Companies:

This was the sector of the Egyptian economy in which the Greeks in Alexandria probably made the largest contribution and also the sector in which they invested the bulk of their capital during this period. In order to appreciate their contribution, the sector will be discussed in terms of the various branches within which the Greeks operated.

1. Cotton Ginning Companies:

By the end of the nineteenth century there were five Joint Stock Companies operating in this branch of industry. In 1899, these five companies had a combined capital of 532,700 Egyptian pounds which represented fifteen percent of all capital invested in industrial companies in Egypt. The Greeks in Alexandria were established in three of the companies, whose combined capital was 501,600 Egyptian pounds, or 94 percent of the total capital. The three companies in which they were involved were the Kafr al-Zayyat Cotton Company Ltd., the Société Anonyme de Presses Libres Egyptienne, and the Société General de Pressage et de Depot. (Radwan, 1974: 278)

The Kafr al-Zayyat Cotton Company Ltd. was essentially a Greek family firm in that it was completely owned and administered by the Zerbinis family. The company was initially established as a result of the reorganisation of another Greek company, Société d'Egrenage et Depot de
Graines, which was founded in 1893 by another Greek from Alexandria, George Ghousios. In the first year of its operations, however, this company made a loss of forty thousand Egyptian pounds. Ghousios appointed Ioannis Zerbinis as managing director, and also sold to him the major part of the shares. (Saktouris, 1915: 463)

The reorganised company was named the Kafr al-Zayyat Cotton Company Ltd., and was registered in Egypt with an initial capital of 50,000 Egyptian pounds. The company owned sixty cotton gins and eight cotton presses which were capable of producing 120,000 quintals of ginned and pressed cotton per year. Within three years, the company was able to purchase an additional eighteen cotton gins and thus increased its production to 160,000 quintals per year. The significance of this output is appreciated when it is noted that Kafr al-Zayyat, the largest cotton ginning centre in the Delta, produced a total of 300,000 quintals per year. Thus, the Greek company produced over half of all the cotton that was ginned and pressed in this Delta town. (Zerbinis, 1956: 23-7)

In 1897, Zerbinis expanded the operations of the company by purchasing a piece of land in Karmus, near Alexandria, and established a branch of the company there. This new branch had thirty-two cotton gins and sixteen oil presses. This expansion increased the company's capital to 105,200 Egyptian pounds, of which eighty thousand was paid up. The Karmus branch, which later became the headquarters of the company, specialised in oil and soap production from the cotton seeds and will be discussed below. By 1899, this one Greek company owned almost twenty percent of all capital invested in this branch of the industry, and three percent of all capital invested in industrial Joint Stock Companies. (Zerbinis, 1956: 58)
The second company, Société General de Pressage et de Dépots, was founded by Zervoudachis in 1889 in order to take over another Greek owned company, the Alexandria Cotton Pressing Company. This company had been established in 1875 by another Greek financier from Alexandria, Ioannis Choremis. Zervoudachis, however, did not invest his own capital in the take over. Instead, he brought together a group of British financiers who eventually took over control of the company. (Paleologhos, 1953: 155) The third company, Société Anonyme de Presses Libres Égyptienne, was founded in 1897 by another Greek financier from Alexandria, Emmanuil Benakis. He was its first director and his descendants occupied the post until the company was nationalised by Nasir in the 1950s. The governing council of the company also included a number of Greek financiers from Alexandria, such as Delaportas, Sarantinidis, Sinadinos and Karidias. This was an Egyptian registered company but almost entirely owned by the Greeks mentioned above.

From the above it will be seen that the Alexandrian Greeks played a central role in this branch of Egyptian industry, which also reflected the diversity of their role during this period of Egyptian economic history. Some entrepreneurs, such as Zerbinis, operated in every sense as an indigenous capitalist and thus his firm was exempt from nationalisation in the 1950s. In fact, Zerbinis was a strong advocate of Egyptian nationalism, contributed to the nationalist struggle and received the benefits in the 1950s. On the other hand, the Greek financial oligarchy played a dual role. They facilitated the growth of European capital in one company, but they also invested their own capital in another company. Their general predisposition, however, was to favour European capital and thus their companies was nationalised in the 1950s.
2. Cotton Textiles:

Despite the importance of such a branch of industry for a predominantly cotton-producing economy, it was not until the very end of the nineteenth century that the first two Joint Stock Companies were founded. In this respect, therefore, both the Greeks in Alexandria and all other potential investors heeded the wishes of Lord Cromer and Lancashire and avoided establishing factories that would compete directly with British capital. In 1899, however, two such companies were established. These were the Anglo-Egyptian Spinning and Weaving Company Ltd. and the Egyptian Cotton Mills Ltd. They were relatively small enterprises and their combined capital totalled 292,500 Egyptian pounds or just over eight percent of the total invested in industrial companies. (Radwan, 1974: 278) The Egyptian Cotton Mills Ltd, which was in fact a British controlled company, operated in Cairo, while the Anglo-Egyptian Spinning and Weaving Company Ltd, which was registered in Egypt, operated in Karmus, near Alexandria.

The Alexandria company was established as a result of a partnership between several Greek and Jewish financiers in that city. The Greek financiers were represented by Salvagos, Zervoudachis and Lascaris, who were also on the board of directors. (Paleologhos, 1953: 161) Nevertheless, neither of the two companies was able to overcome the obstacles created by Cromer's economic policies and the British company was declared bankrupt in 1907. The Alexandria company continued operations until 1912, albeit with heavy losses. During this period, therefore, this branch of industry was greatly underdeveloped, but the Greek financiers were involved in half of the limited capital that had been invested. In general, however, the above suggests that it was the hegemony of British capital and political control in Egypt which
ultimately determined what type of enterprise or which branch of industry would be developed. This fact, which characterised the Egyptian economy during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, was also well reflected in the economic role of the Greeks in Alexandria. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the economic policies of Lord Cromer were so obviously biased towards British interests, that even the pro-British Greek financial oligarchy was forced at times to challenge them. They could not resist, of course, the obvious attraction of establishing a cotton textile enterprise in a country whose primary production was top quality cotton.

3. Tobacco and Cigarettes:

This was a branch of industry in which the Greeks in Egypt played both a pioneering and dominant role during the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, the majority of the factories were established in Cairo, and until 1900, all the factories were privately owned family firms. The only cigarette factory to be established in Alexandria was the Greek Tobacco Manufacturing Company which was established by the Coutarelli brothers in 1890. It operated on Nubar street, in the centre of Alexandria, and employed only twenty workers by the end of the century. This is in distinct contrast to the Tsanaklis factory in Cairo, for example, which employed well over three hundred workers during the same period. The only distinction of the Coutarelli factory is that its products, being of lower quality, were destined exclusively for the Egyptian market. This is in contrast to the Cairo factories which produced high quality and expensive cigarettes, destined exclusively for the elite European markets. It was this characteristic, however, which
permitted the Coutarelli factory to emerge as the leading cigarette manufacturer in Egypt during the twentieth century.

4. Soft Drinks and Beer:

By the end of the century there were three Joint Stock Companies operating in this branch of industry. These three factories, two of which produced beer, had a combined capital of 118,400 Egyptian pounds which represented just over three percent of all investments in industrial companies in 1899. The Greeks in Alexandria were involved in the two beer factories as major share-holders and directors. The Crown Brewery of Alexandria, for example, was established in 1897, by the two brothers, Miltiadis and Erikos Klonaridis, with an initial capital of fifty-six thousand Egyptian pounds. The company, which was capable of producing ten thousand hectolitres per hour, was registered in Belgium, and over half of its shares were owned by Belgian financiers. In 1899, the Klonaridis brothers established a branch of this company in Cairo, Crown Brewery of Cairo, with an initial capital of sixty thousand Egyptian pounds. Once more the company was registered in Belgium and the major part of the shares were held by Belgian financiers. It should be noted, however, that the Greeks in Cairo operated a number of soft drinks enterprises, most of which were family owned companies. The three major factories were owned respectively by Emmanuil Papparis, Nikolaos Spathis, and a partnership between Paleologhos and Malaxiou. (Paleologhos, 1953: 109 & 133) Thus, although this was a relatively small branch of industry, Greek involvement was quite substantial.

5. Oil and Soap:

By the end of the century there were three Joint Stock Companies operating in this branch of industry, representing just over three
percent of all investments in this sector of the Egyptian economy, and the Greeks in Alexandria were active in one of them. The Société des Huileries et Savonneries d'Egypte was founded in 1889 by Emmanuil Benakis with an initial capital of seventy thousand Egyptian pounds. It was an Egyptian registered company and represented sixty percent of all investments in this branch of industry. (Paleologhos, 1953: 93) It should be pointed out, however, that the Zerbinis enterprises, mentioned above, became one of the leading producers of oil and soap, from cotton seed, during the twentieth century.

6. Salt and Soda:

During this period there was only one Joint Stock Company operating in this branch of industry. The Egyptian Salt and Soda Company Ltd, was founded in 1899, with an initial capital of 301,000 Egyptian pounds and registered in Britain. (Radwan, 1974: 278) It was established as a result of a partnership of four Greek and one French financier from Alexandria. The Greek partners were Benakis, Zervoudachis, Salvagos and Choremis, while the Frenchman was Eugene Debourg. Once more this was an instance of the Greeks in Alexandria making use of an exclusive government concession in order to expedite the growth of European capital in the Egyptian economy. The salt concession had been awarded to Choremis, who also became the first President of the company, and his descendants continued to administer the company until the late 1930s. (Paleologhos, 1953: 93)

7. Paper:

There was only one Joint Stock Company that operated in this branch of industry during this period. The Fabrique Egyptienne de Papier was founded in 1897 by Konstantinos Laghoudakis who was also the sole owner
of all the shares which amounted to 7,700 Egyptian pounds. As indicated in the previous section, Laghoudakis established his first workshop in Alexandria in 1877, but after it was destroyed in the events of 1882, he moved to new premises on Cleopatra street in 1895, and started to produce different kinds of stationary for business purposes and cigarette paper and cartons. It should be pointed out, however, that until the end of the century, Laghoudakis produced these items from imported paper. During the twentieth century he also started to produce paper in his factory in Alexandria and went on to become the leading paper manufacturer in the Near East. (Paleologhos, 1953: 309)

The above account represents the total participation of the Greeks in Alexandria in industrial Joint Stock Companies during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. The Greeks in this city, however, were involved in a number of other branches of the industrial sector through family owned enterprises and these are discussed below.

8. Leather Tanning and Leather Products:

As indicated in the previous section, the Greeks in Alexandria played a pioneering role in this branch of industry since the 1850s. By 1882, there were six leather tanning factories operating in Alexandria, two were owned by Greeks, one was owned by the Egyptian government and administered by a Greek and the other three were owned and administered by Egyptians. During the two decades of the 1880s and 1890s, six new factories were established in Alexandria and all of them were owned and administered by Greeks from Alexandria. These family owned manufacturing firms were Dimitris Mitsas, Pavlos and Michalis Statiras, Ioannis Tsalikas, Pavlos Axarlis, George Corakis and Stavros Bollas, who
was the only one to have a partner, another Greek from Alexandria, George Marvelis. (Paleologhos, 1953: 208; Politis, 1930: 305)

Up to 1898, all twelve factories had premises in Mazarita, near the Alexandria suburb of Chatby, and employed simple machines in their production process. In that year, the Alexandria municipality re-located the twelve factories to Mex, approximately five kilometres outside the city, because the population growth in the city meant that Chatby needed to expand. The re-location, which was not completed until 1904, proved beneficial for this branch of industry. All the Greeks factories imported the latest machinery for their new premises and thus improved their productivity considerably. (Politis, 1930: 305-6) By the end of the century, therefore, the Greeks in Alexandria owned eight of the twelve factories in operation.

9. Alcoholic Beverages:

This was another branch of industry in which the Greeks in Alexandria played both a pioneering and dominant role. The first such factory was founded in 1884 by Christos Bolonakis. Initially this family owned firm produced cognac and rum which was not sold. The firm stored its products in large vats of between ten and fifteen thousand litres each until 1894, and then started to sell in the Alexandria market. This date coincided with the first International Industrial Fair to take place in Egypt, and Bolonakis received several awards for his products. This encouraged the firm to enter the export market, and within a few years they were exporting brandy to Britain. During the twentieth century the firm developed a virtual monopoly over this branch of manufacturing. (Politis, 1930: 358-9)
10. Alcohol Production:

Given the pioneering role of the Bolonakis firm in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages, it is not surprising that they would also be interested in the production of alcohol. Low quality alcohol was being produced by an Egyptian government enterprise from its monopoly over sugar production. Bolonakis, however, required high quality alcohol for his beverages and had to rely upon three Greek merchant firms in Alexandria to import it from Austria, Germany and Russia. In 1890, however, Bolonakis contributed to the establishment of a factory in Alexandria which was to be administered by the same three Greek merchants, the Kotsikas brothers, Polichronis and Theocharis. The first few years of production were difficult because they were unable to produce the quality needed by Bolonakis for his beverages. Thus, all three firms continued to import high quality alcohol. In 1895, Kotsikas imported new machinery and succeeded in producing 96 proof alcohol at the rate of one and a half million kilograms per year per unit of production. Kotsikas had four production units and the six million kilograms of production surpassed the total production of the government factory which never achieved more than one million per year. By 1900, the Kotsikas factory dominated this branch of industry, and by 1903 the government factory was forced to close. This left Kotsikas with a monopoly over the production of alcohol until the 1930s. (Politis, 1930: 352-4)

11. Confectionery:

This was another branch of industry in which the Greeks played a dominant role. In addition to the factories that were discussed in the previous section, three new factories were established in Alexandria
during the 1880s and 1890s. These were the factories Pandelis Theodosiou, 1880, Theodoros Kasinidis, 1893, and Christos Pittas in 1896. Along with the factories established prior to 1880, the Greeks in Alexandria had a virtual monopoly in this branch of industry. The quality of their production was such that they were also able to enter the export market. Kasinidis, for example, exported Loukoumi (Turkish Delight) to Britain. (Paleologhos, 1953: 128)

12. Candles:

This was a branch of industry which was completely controlled by the Greeks in Alexandria. Up to 1900, there were two factories operating in Alexandria which supplied most of the needs of the Christian churches in Egypt and the confectionery factories. The first factory was that established by Anastasia Mitziali in 1882. In addition to being the only Greek woman in Alexandria who entered industry, her firm produced candles of such quality that they were exported to Cyprus, several Greek islands and other Greek communities in Africa. The second factory was that established by Christos Pittas, mentioned above in confectionery production, in 1883, and it produced seven tons per year. One of the obstacles in expanding production confronted by both these factories was the absence of cheap paraffin. Paraffin sales in Egypt were monopolised by four international companies, Standard Oil, Asiatic Petroleum, Indo-Burma Company and Steel Brothers. The Alexandria Greeks tried to produce paraffin in Egypt, but their efforts were thwarted by the four giants who were also supported by Lord Cromer. (Paleologhos, 1953: 187)

Thus, it is possible to conclude that whether it was cotton textiles or cheap paraffin for candle production, the Greeks in Alexandria had to take into account the policies and attitudes of Lord Cromer. This was
despite the fact that they may have been pro-British or anti-British in their economic and political orientation. European capitalist hegemony over Egypt's economy started to develop from the moment Egyptian cotton entered the international market. But with the British military occupation of 1882, the hegemony of especially British capital was institutionalised. This chapter has however demonstrated that the Greeks in Alexandria played a significant role in the transformation of the Egyptian economy during the nineteenth century; and the material presented in this chapter confirms that Alexandria during the nineteenth century was essentially a Greek bourgeois city. Given the centrality of Alexandria in the Egyptian economy, there is no question that the Greeks played a central role in the Egyptian economy during this period.

Furthermore, this chapter has also identified the diverse economic roles of the Greeks in Alexandria and demonstrated that it would be wrong to consider them en bloc as either agents of European capitalism or as constituting indigenous capitalism. We have the situation whereby some Greeks performed the role of agents at some points of time in the historical process of transformation, while other Greeks performed a very different role. The prominent Greek merchants, for example, played a leading role which assisted Muhammad 'Ali to frustrate European efforts to control the Egyptian economy, but in doing so they also facilitated the integration of Egypt into the international division of labour as a producer of one agricultural commodity, cotton. This, of course, contributed to Egypt's transformation into a peripheral economy. This encouraged the economic role of the Greek financial oligarchy, who also reflected developments that occurred in European society, and thus accelerated Egypt's dependence, leading eventually to the hegemony of British capital over her economic and political affairs.
In other words, the Greeks reflected most predominant trends and forces within Egyptian society, and thus they constituted a mediating factor between internal and external transformations. They responded to the different trends in Egyptian and European economic transformations in order to improve their socio-economic position. The Greeks did, however, also organise themselves in an institutionalised ethnic community, and it is, therefore, necessary to examine the socio-cultural and political organisation of the Greeks in Alexandria.
CHAPTER FIVE
Capitalism and Ethnicity:
The Foundation and Development of the Greek Community in Alexandria

The Greeks in Alexandria organised themselves into a paroikia (colony) two decades prior to the formal establishment of the koinotita (community) in 1854, as a legal entity independent from both the Greek Consulate and the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Alexandria. It was during these two decades, however, that the Greeks in Alexandria set the pattern of their socio-economic, cultural and political organisation that was to characterise not only their future development, but also the development of all the other Greek paroikies into koinotites in Egypt and the Sudan in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Three factors contributed to this particular pattern of development: first, the previous mode of organising Greek merchant colonies into koinotites in Europe during the eighteenth century; second, the pattern of socio-economic and political organisation adopted by Muhammad 'Ali in order to modernise Egypt; and third, the effect of The Age of Revolution in Europe on the attitudes and political orientation of the Greeks in Egypt.

Both the Greeks who emigrated to Europe, during the eighteenth century, and Muhammad 'Ali in Egypt, during the nineteenth century, had similar objectives: the establishment of a form of socio-economic and political organisation where merchant capital, liberated from the restrictions of feudal structures, could play a dominant role and develop rapidly. In the case of the Greeks, who arrived in Europe at a time of rapid socio-
economic and political transformation, they attempted to establish their own communities by reproducing elements of the bourgeois structures that were emerging in several parts of Europe at that time. Given the prevailing and dominant feudal and oligarchic structures in Egypt at the start of the nineteenth century, however, Muhammad 'Ali was forced to rely upon State intervention (monopolies) in order to encourage the rapid transformation of Egyptian society along the European pattern. In fact, his policies did not differ much from those adopted by many capitalist states such as Germany and Japan. Thus, from the very start, Muhammad 'Ali's reliance upon excessive State intervention, in order to facilitate the rapid development of mercantile capitalism, generated two important contradictions which played a central role in the future of modern Egyptian history.

First, his policies immediately set him on a collision course with the interests of an expansionist and merchant capitalist Europe. It was a collision course which was ultimately resolved in favour of capitalist Europe when Britain successfully invaded Egypt in 1882. Nevertheless, this early challenge to the global supremacy of European capitalism has failed to attract the attention of most economic historians. Eric Hobsbawm is one of the few historians who appreciated this evolving contradiction, when he acknowledged the historical significance of Muhammad 'Ali's policies in his book entitled *The Age of Revolution* (1973)

*Admittedly, the world-wide revolt against the West, which dominates the middle of the twentieth century, was yet barely discernible. Only in the Islamic world can we observe the first stages of that process by which those conquered by the West have adopted its ideas and techniques to turn the tables on it: in the beginnings of internal westernizing reform within the Turkish empire in the 1830s, and above all the neglected and significant career of Mohammad Ali of Egypt. (Hobsbawm, 1973: 16)*
Second, Muhammad 'Ali established his power and initiated his policies in Egypt, subsequent to defeating militarily the French in 1801, the British in 1805, and the Egyptian feudal aristocracy (Mamelukes) in 1811. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 53-5) Having physically removed the Egyptian landed/military aristocracy and antagonised both the British and French, Muhammad 'Ali turned to Greek, Levantine and other merchants from the eastern Mediterranean for assistance in carrying out his policies. These non-Egyptian merchants, therefore, became a substitute for both European mercantile practices and an indigenous merchant class. It was this particular pattern of development, however, that also inhibited the emergence of any form of Egyptian agrarian, merchant, financial or industrial bourgeoisie until the 1920s, even though the Egyptian economy was being rapidly transformed towards a socio-economic structure within which merchant capitalism could develop. It is possible, therefore, to suggest that Egypt's transformation during the nineteenth century was carried out by a colonial-settler class which was composed of an alliance between the Turkish aristocracy and eastern Mediterranean merchants and financiers.

This, of course, implanted the seeds of a potential conflict of interests between the Turkish ruling class (Muhammad 'Ali and his descendants) and its non-Egyptian bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and practically all Egyptian classes, on the other. This contradiction was expressed vehemently in 1881, the 'Urabi Revolution, again in the 1919 Revolution led by Sa'd Zaghlul, and finally in 1952, when Nasir removed from power and expelled from Egypt the last descendant of Muhammad 'Ali, King Faruq.

Throughout the nineteenth century the city of Alexandria exemplified both contradictions generated by Muhammad 'Ali's reforms. It was in
Alexandria that European imperialism arrived, un-successfully in 1801 and 1805, and successfully in 1882, and in that same city that the non-Egyptian mercantile and financial bourgeoisie flourished. Nevertheless, as Lord Cromer acknowledged, Alexandria "may almost be said to be a Greek town". Thus, it must again be emphasised that the Greek community of Alexandria played a central role in the transformation of Egyptian society during the nineteenth century. As indicated above, however, this role was conditioned by three factors. Two of them have already been discussed, so it is necessary to discuss some aspects of the third, the effect of European revolutions on the ideological orientation of the Greeks in Alexandria.

The French Revolution provided the first major effect on the ideological orientation of both the Greeks in Egypt and in the eastern Mediterranean. In particular, the Greeks in Egypt absorbed many of the characteristics of the French Revolution through their close association with the Napoleonic military expedition in Egypt, 1798 - 1801. The significance of this impact is emphasised by Hadziiooissif who noted that the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Alexandria was so alarmed by the republican tendencies among the Greeks that "...it launched a vigorous ideological counter-attack". (Hadziiooissif, 1980: 376) A further indication of the influence of the French Revolution may be obtained from a reading of the successive reports from the French Consul-General in Cairo which indicate that many indigenous Christians lamented the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy, and that they had even gone as far as establishing an association in Cairo with a nominal Emperor, Princes and a Republican spirit. (Hadziiooissif, 1980: 376-7)

An immediate and concrete result of this republican spirit was the role and participation of the Greeks in Egypt in the Greek Revolution of
1821. As to the extent of their ideological commitment to the Revolution of 1821, this is indicated by the fact that when the Greek merchants in Alexandria established their first community, they adopted as their emblem the symbol of the Philiki Etairia, the revolutionary society that led the Greek insurrection against the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, they continued to follow closely political developments in Europe and Greece during the 1830s and 1840s. They applauded the events of July 1830 in France, and the constitutional changes in Britain in 1832. When Greek anti-Royalists challenged the hegemony of the foreign-imposed monarchy in 1843, there were celebrations among the Greeks in Alexandria and Cairo. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 378-9)

It was the presence of Italian political exiles in Alexandria, however, which contributed to the ideological development and radicalisation of the Greeks in that city. The Italian exiles, having escaped from the many absolutist States in Italy, organised a number of secret political societies in Alexandria which advocated a radical bourgeois ideology. (Lachanokardis, 1927: 96-9) It was much later in the century that the Italian political exiles in Alexandria also brought socialist ideas and contributed towards the establishment of the first Greek workers association in 1872. (Kipiadis, 1892: 62) It was this association, discussed in chapter two, which criticised both the British and Greek propaganda during the events of 1882 through its newspaper Elpis. (Xenos, 1957: 20) It is in order to elaborate on these aspects of the modern history of both the Greeks in Alexandria and Egyptian society that it is necessary to examine in some detail the establishment and development of the Greek community in Alexandria during the nineteenth century.
I. The Status of the Greeks in Egypt, 1800 - 1833

In order to highlight the specificity of the Alexandria Greek koinotita (community), which was formally established in 1854, it is necessary to examine its foundation and development within the broader pattern of socio-economic organisation of all non-Islamic communities in the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, it is necessary to highlight the initial steps taken by the Greeks in Alexandria which ultimately led to the establishment of their koinotita. This was the unilateral withdrawal from the Ottoman millet system and the establishment of the semi-autonomous organisation of the paroikia (colony).

Most Orientalists characterise the Ottoman Empire as a theocratic State in which the Khalifa (Caliph/Sultan) was both supreme political and religious leader. Given that the religion of the State was Islam, this posed a problem with regards to the governing of the large non-Muslim communities of which the Greek nation was only one. The Ottoman solution to the problem was the establishment of the millet system by which non-Muslims were subdivided and governed according to religious denominations. (Gibb and Bowen, 1950) It is beyond the scope of this thesis to present a critical account of this Orientalist perception of socio-economic organisation in the Ottoman Empire which presents an ahistorical and simplistic account of socio-economic and political dynamics. Nevertheless, it is possible, for the purpose of this account, to rely upon this Orientalist account for an outline of the essential phenomenological characteristics of the millet system.

Each millet was responsible for its own cultural, economic, social and religious organisation, and its leader, who was also the spiritual leader, was directly responsible to the Ottoman authorities. This was
particularly the case with regards to the imposition of Ottoman taxes on the various non-Muslim communities. The taxes were imposed collectively on a denominational grouping, and it was the responsibility of the religious leader to collect them proportionately from the members of the community on behalf of the Ottoman administration. Furthermore, each millet had its own judicial courts, based usually on theocratic principles, for settling all internal matters, and all communal property such as educational, health and religious institutions was registered in the name of the spiritual leader who was also the chief spokesman for the millet. In fact, it is this Orientalist characterisation of the Ottoman Empire which has led to the widely accepted notion of Middle Eastern society being "...a mosaic of more or less self-sufficient, self-contained, self-governing social groups". (Owen, 1975: 104)

Most Greek historians who discuss the history of the Greek community in Alexandria rely upon the above characterisation for an account of the socio-economic and political organisation of the Greek communities in the Ottoman Empire. (Gialourakis, 1967; Politis, 1929; Radopoulos, 1928; Tsirkas, 1973) Thus, according to these accounts, all Greeks who were also Greek Orthodox (because some Greeks in Thessaloniki were Jewish and others in the islands were Catholics) belonged to one of the four major sub-groupings into which the Greek Orthodox millet was sub-divided. The four sub-divisions were organised according to geographical location and proximity to one of the four Greek Orthodox Patriarchates: Alexandria, Antioch, Istanbul, and Jerusalem. The Greeks in Egypt, for example, came under the jurisdiction of the Alexandria Patriarchate, while the Greeks in Greece were under the jurisdiction of the Istanbul Patriarchate. All four Patriarchates were theologically of equal status, but the Istanbul Patriarchate was first among equals. This
theological situation, along with the geographical location of the Istanbul Patriarchate, permitted the Patriarch of Constantinople to act as the sole representative of the entire Greek Orthodox millet with regards to the Ottoman authorities. Thus, it is not surprising that the election of a new Patriarch in any of the other three Patriarchates required the approval of the Constantinople Patriarch whose own election was also subject to Ottoman approval. According to this administrative and political hierarchy, therefore, the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Istanbul governed and ruled, in the name of the Ottoman Sultan, all Greeks who were also Greek Orthodox. (Politis, 1929: 249-59)

Though the four Greek Orthodox Patriarchs were responsible for their respective geographical areas, the local affairs in each city, town, or village were organised by a demogerontia (council of elders). The titular head of each demogerontia was the Patriarch responsible for that particular administrative area, but in fact it was controlled by a priest who was also the official representative of the Patriarch. In principle, all Greeks who were also Greek Orthodox and Ottoman subjects were entitled to be elected as a demogeron (elder). In practice, however, it was wealthy landlords, merchants or financiers who were usually elected. Furthermore, the extent to which a particular demogerontia could maintain a certain degree of autonomy from its respective Patriarchate varied according to its geographical proximity to the Patriarchate and its relative economic status. This also applied to the degree of autonomy exercised by each Patriarchate with regard to the Patriarchate of Istanbul and the Ottoman Sultan. Prior to the 1830s, for example, all the demogeronties in Egypt, due to their poverty, were completely under the control of the Alexandria Patriarchate. Similarly, the Alexandria Patriarchate, which was also
very poor, was greatly dependent on the Istanbul Patriarchate with regard to all its internal affairs and its relations with the Ottoman authorities. (Politis, 1929: 256-9)

Given such an administrative and political structure, it is not surprising that several wealthy Greek merchants in Egypt had sought and obtained other European citizenships in order to avoid being under the jurisdiction of the Alexandria Patriarchate and the Ottoman authorities. The establishment of the Greek Consulate in Egypt in 1833, however, permitted most Greeks in Egypt, whether rich or poor, to change their status by adopting Greek citizenship.

It is important, however, to note that obtaining Greek citizenship did not also imply any form of nationalistic loyalties on the part of the Greek merchants. Greek citizenship was primarily a means of ensuring protection for their commercial enterprises; and there is evidence to suggest that when they did not receive the necessary support and protection from the Greek Consular authorities, they immediately sought another European citizenship. George Averoff, for example, in a letter to the Greek government dated the 8th of March, 1951 requested "...the government to deliver us from the Greek Consul in Cairo, otherwise we shall be obliged to change citizenship". It seems that the Greek Consul in Cairo was unable to satisfy the commercial requirements of the Greeks in that city and in that same year, George Zaccalis and Vasilis Georgalas abandoned their Greek citizenship. (Foreign Affairs, 1851: 36-1)

Another aspect related to obtaining Greek citizenship, already mentioned in chapter one, was the question of who was entitled to receive it. As many of the Greeks in Alexandria had come from parts of Greece that were
still occupied by the Ottoman Empire, they were technically Ottoman subjects. The most prominent such case was that of Michalis Tossitsas who was also Greek Consul-General although he originated in Metsovon which was still under Ottoman occupation. Not all the Greeks who arrived in Alexandria, however, had the same close relationship with Muhammad 'Ali. Thus, most Greeks had to employ various legal loopholes which would permit them to satisfy the Egyptian authorities of their entitlement to Greek citizenship. One such method was to prove that they had resided in a liberated part of Greece for a period of five years prior to their arrival in Egypt. This, of course, involved a considerable amount of time, and many Greeks found ways of shortening the period. Some bribed local officials in parts of liberated Greece who then provided them with the necessary documentation. Others, like George Averoff, bribed officials at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Greece and received a Greek passport on the basis that he was a resident of Athens. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 396-7)

The easiest method to obtain Greek citizenship, however, involved bribing the Greek Consular officials in Egypt. The Greek Consular official in Cairo, Loucas Calogeropoulos, seems to have made a fortune selling Greek passports. For example, for the sum of eighteen thousand Egyptian piasters he gave Greek citizenship to an Egyptian Copt, 'Abd al-Sa'id Gauhari, and then appointed him as his Consular agent in Asiyut, Southern Egypt. Apostolos Stavros Cavasios, an Ottoman subject from Istanbul, received Greek citizenship from the same Consular official for the sum of three thousand Egyptian piasters. In fact, it was Cavasios who informed the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the activities of their Consular official. In a letter dated the 24th of
June, 1853, he gave the Ministry several such examples of Consular
corruption. (Foreign Affairs, 1853: 36-1)

A noteworthy example of such Consular corruption was the case of the
Abet brothers, Ananias and Raphael, who received Greek citizenship in
1834 and 1843 respectively. The Abet family was of Syrian origin, but
had converted to Greek Orthodoxy prior to their arrival in Egypt. Once
they were established in Egypt, they engaged in commerce and by the
early 1830s were among the most prosperous merchants in Alexandria.
Ananias Abet was among those who helped found the Greek community in
Alexandria. The brothers continued to play a prominent role in the
affairs of the community and in 1861 they established a Greek school in
Cairo. (Politis, 1929: 442-6) In the twentieth century, this school,
Ambetios, became the most important Greek educational establishment in
Egypt, and in the 1980s is the only Greek school still operating in
Cairo. Politis, in his well-known modern history of the Greeks in
Egypt, devotes forty pages to the discussion of the many contributions
made by the Abet brothers to the Greek community in Cairo, and
especially the role of Ambetios.

Despite the corruption involved in the granting of Greek citizenship to
Greeks who were Ottoman subjects or other Arab merchants, what is
important to note is that from 1833, the Greeks in Egypt, with Greek
citizenship, no longer came under the jurisdiction of the millet system
and thus were able to form paroikies. Economically, juridically and
politically they were now under the control and protection of the Greek
Consulate which was also responsible for settling any disputes emerging
within the paroikia. This was done through a system of special judicial
courts established by the Alexandria Greek Consulate and all the other
Greek sub-Consulates in Egypt. Following the Capitulations, these
courts applied Greek Civil Codes and the judges were Consular Officials. (Issa, 1970: 58-61) This change of socio-legal and political status for the Greeks in Egypt also implied a major change in their relationship with the Alexandria Greek Orthodox Patriarchate. Thus, subsequent to 1833, the relationship between the paroikia and the Patriarchate was purely spiritual.
II. The Foundation of the Greek Community in Alexandria, 1833 - 1854

The formal establishment of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria in 1854 was the first instance of the transformation of a paroikia into a koinotita in Egypt. The significance of its establishment goes beyond the fact that the second koinotita to be established, that of Zagazig in the Delta, was not until 1870, or that the second most prominent koinotita in Egypt, that of Cairo, was not established until the 19th of July, 1904. The early establishment of the Alexandria koinotita and the fact that it was the largest in Egypt is, of course, of some importance. Nevertheless, it is the manner in which it was organised that attributes to the Greek koinotita of Alexandria a pioneering role in the modern history of both the Greeks in the Diaspora and Egypt. Its socio-economic and political organisation and juridical status differed dramatically from that of any other Greek, or for that matter non-Islamic, community or settlement throughout the Ottoman Empire.

The recognition in 1833 of the new socio-legal and political status of the Greeks in Egypt, encouraged several Greek merchants in Alexandria to work towards the formalisation of their newly achieved status as a paroikia. Thus, within a decade, on the 9th of February, 1843, a meeting of Greek merchants in Alexandria was organised in order to collect donations for the administration of the Greek school and hospital. Both these institutions had existed for a number of years, but the first archival records of their existence and administration date from the establishment of the Greek Consulate in 1833. In these records it is clear that the administration and most of the funding of both institutions was the responsibility of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria. For example, in addition to financial contributions by Theodoros and Michalis Tossitsas and their nephew Nikolaos Stournaras,
the rest of the funds seem to have been obtained from a financial contribution paid by all Greek ships to the Greek Consulate at the time of their departure from Alexandria. (Politis, 1929: 260) The minutes from this meeting of the 9th of February, 1843, indicate that forty-five persons contributed a total of 9,245 Egyptian piasters towards the hospital and one hundred and seventy-six persons contributed a total of 25,934 Egyptian Piasters towards the school. (Politis, 1929: 261; Radopoulos, 1928: 11)

Having made the financial contributions, those concerned were keen to oversee the manner in which their funds would be spent. They quickly realised, however, that meetings of all concerned at regular intervals were impractical. Thus, on the 25th of April, 1843, a meeting of the general assembly was organised at the Saint Savas monastery, the only Greek Orthodox church in Alexandria at the time, and thirty-eight persons attended. (Radopoulos, 1928: 12) Many Greek historians consider this meeting as constituting the informal establishment of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria, although they also point out that its legal constitution as an autonomous legal body according to Greek civil law occurred by Royal Decree as late as the 8th of June, 1887. (Politis, 1929: 262; Hadziiossif, 1980: 336)

The reason for considering the 1843 meeting as the first informal act of the koinotita derives from the fact that those attending decided to elect Michalis Tossitsas as President, and Ioannis d'Anastasy and Stefanos Zizinias as Vice-Presidents of the general assembly and twelve other persons to oversee the affairs of the hospital and school on behalf of the general assembly. The meeting also noted that all members of the general assembly would henceforth be obliged to pay an annual subscription, to be determined by the committee, which would be used
towards the administration of the hospital and school. Furthermore, the minutes also emphasised that all major decisions would have to be taken to the general assembly where they would have to be approved by the majority and the minority would also be compelled to sign the majority decision. (see appendix one) This was a crucial point with regards to the development of the Greek community in Alexandria. The election of a twelve-person committee to administer the affairs of the community was a significant departure from the traditional demogerontia. Also, the emphasis on "majority rule" introduced and established the first principles of bourgeois democracy in a society where autocracy and oligarchy were prevalent. In fact, even in Greece at the time, it was still the royal family which made all important decisions without any reference to the government or population. (Tsirkas, 1973: 44-5)

Nevertheless, at that meeting the general assembly did not approve any statutes or regulations for the administration of the paroikia, nor did they refer to themselves as a koinotita. Instead, they characterised the meeting as "...a gathering of the undermentioned [financial] contributors to the school". [my translation] (Anon, 1862: 44)

Admittedly this meeting introduced the first principles of bourgeois socio-political organisation, and during the next decade the paroikia continued to expand its activities. Formally, however, it was not yet a koinotita, because they had yet to organise the internal administration of their affairs which were still under the supervision of the Greek Consulate. It was not until the 1st of January, 1854, that the paroikia formalised its existence by approving its internal statutes and regulations, and thus became formally a koinotita. (see appendix two) The Founding Statutes of the Greek-Egyptian Koinotita (Community) of the Orthodox in Alexandria, as the statutes and regulations were...
entitled, were signed by the new President of the self-declared koinotita, Michalis Tossitsas, and submitted to the Greek Consulate in Alexandria, which had been responsible for the protection and administration of all paroikia property and institutions up to that date. (Radopoulos, 1928: 22; Politis, 1929: 270) The Greek Consul-General, of course, was none other than Michalis Tossitsas, who avoided communicating this event to the Greek authorities in Greece. In fact, in all the Consular correspondence with Greece up to 1854, there is no mention of the fact that the paroikia had now become a koinotita. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 340) Subsequent to the submission of the statutes and regulations to the Greek Consulate, the Greek paroikia, transformed now into a koinotita, took on the responsibility of administering its own affairs without any supervision from the Consulate. For obvious reasons, however, the political protection afforded by the Greek Consulate, due to the Capitulations, was preserved.

It was during the period 1843 to 1854 that the paroikia established several principles of socio-economic and political organisation which confirm its bourgeois democratic character. This is evident in the activities of the twelve-member committee and its chairman, Michalis Tossitsas, who had been elected in order to administer the hospital and school. The first meeting of the committee took place on the 1st of May, 1843 and thereafter it met regularly. At that first meeting they elected a secretary, Georgios Pesmatzoglou, as treasurer, Nikolaos Tzakalis, and two sub-committees consisting of five members each which would take on the direct responsibility of administering the hospital and school respectively. The first task of each of the sub-committees was the preparation of the internal regulations for the administration of the hospital and school. These regulations were approved by the
whole committee on the 30th of May and the 29th of August, 1843, respectively. (Radopoulos, 1928: 15)

The evolving character of the *paroikia* is quite evident in the internal regulations for the administration of the hospital and school. The hospital regulations, for example, noted that the hospital

...is under the protection of the Greek General-Consulate with regards to political affairs, and as to religious affairs it is under the protection of the Virgin Mary, whose remembrance day is on the 8th of September, which shall henceforth be considered as the day on which the hospital was established. [my translation] (Anon, 1862: 5)

The absence of any reference to the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Alexandria highlighted the secular nature of the evolving organisation by suggesting a significant departure from the pattern practised by all non-Muslim communities in the Ottoman Empire for several centuries. This is particularly so when it is noted that when the hospital was first established on the 17th of November, 1817, it had been placed "...under the exclusive protection of the Greek Patriarchate in Alexandria". (Firipidou, 1931: 136; Hadziiossif, 1980: 339) Its significance, of course, derives from the fact that Egypt was still an Ottoman province in 1843, and many of the members of the Greek community were Ottoman subjects, who should have come under the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate. Furthermore, placing property which was communally owned by the community under the protection of the Greek Consulate was both a departure from common practice under the Capitulations, and an illustration of the manner in which the Greek merchants of Alexandria made every effort to safeguard their individual and communal affairs and property. This is because the members of the Greek *paroikia* held a number of different citizenships. Under the Capitulations, it was only the citizens of a particular country that had the right to be protected
by the Consulate of that country. Ioannis d'Anastasy and Stefanos Zizinias, the two Vice-Presidents of the community, were Swedish and French citizens respectively.

The Greeks in Alexandria, however, exemplifying the spirit of merchant capital, could not confine themselves to just one citizenship, especially when much of the trade was with such countries as France and Britain. They satisfied their ethnic identity by placing their communal property under the protection of the Greek Consulate, and safeguarded their commercial interests by keeping other European citizenships. Of course, this strategy was to prove quite useful for the community in 1854, with the Crimean crisis and the rupture of relations between Greece and Egypt, and again in 1882, when the British occupied Egypt. By appointing new presidents who held the appropriate citizenship, they guaranteed the protection of their communal organisation and property.

Another important aspect of the evolving character of the paroikia is evident in the internal regulations of the school which stated that...

...tuition is free for all young persons and admission is open to young persons from all nationalities who wish to learn our colloquial language and Greek, and for Greeks who wish to learn French and Italian. (my translation) (Radopoulos, 1928: 16)

French and Italian were the two languages used in commercial and financial transactions in the eastern Mediterranean at the time. The availability of these languages in the school for Greek students emphasised the mercantile character of the community. Furthermore, that the school admitted children from all nationalities to study Greek emphasised both an aspect of mission civilisatrice, prevalent in most European colonial attitudes during the nineteenth century, and the concern of the community to gain the respect and cooperation of Egyptians. In fact, amongst those who attended the meeting of the 25th
of April, 1843, was one Arian Abet who was of Syrian origin, but settled in Egypt for a number of years and a prosperous merchant in Alexandria. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 338) Finally, the fact that tuition was free at the school emphasised the extent to which the community perceived the importance of education for all. In itself this principle exemplified a characteristic of an evolving bourgeois social entity.

The Alexandria paroikia had satisfied an important principle of bourgeois society, the separation of civil society from the church; its 1843 meeting failed to make any reference to the Greek Orthodox patriarchate of Alexandria. Nevertheless, most of the Greeks in Alexandria at the time also felt that they needed some form of spiritual organisation. Thus, on the 30th of May, 1844, Michalis Tossitsas and Stefanos Zizinias distributed an announcement calling a meeting of the general assembly in order to discuss the establishment of a church. It is interesting that the announcement itself started with a statement which re-asserted their separation from the Patriarchate.

Having known for some time the desire of the Christians in this city to construct a church within it, which would be owned communally and controlled by the community, we went to His Holiness and received permission to build a church. Because this construction will be communal and will be controlled by the community and everything has to be arranged by the community of this city, the undersigned call upon the general assembly to a meeting. [my translation] (Anon, 1862: 46)

The meeting took place on the 1st of June, 1844, at the house of Michalis Tossitsas, where two messages were read out: the permission obtained from the Patriarch and a message from Muhammad 'Ali, who noted "...construct a church which is grandiose so that even I may be proud of it, and if you need a firman (official Ottoman decision/order) then I shall grant you one". [my translation] (Anon, 1862: 7) Muhammad 'Ali's message was particularly significant for the development of the new
forms of socio-political organisation adopted by the Greeks in Alexandria. In the Ottoman Empire at the time, all construction of non-Islamic religious institutions required a firman from the Sultan which was normally obtained by the head of the particular millet. In this case the Alexandria Greeks would have had to rely on the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria and thus succumb to his control and jurisdiction. Thus, encouraged by Muhammad 'Ali's support the meeting decided to spare no effort or material resources in order to construct "...a National Church according to the examples of Greek paroikies in Trieste and other parts of Europe, and not those in Turkey". [my translation] (Radopoulos, 1928: 21)

However, the collection of financial donations for the construction of the church did not take place until 1847, with the foundation stone being laid on the 1st of September in that year. (Anon, 1862: 7; Radopoulos, 1928: 19) The reason for the delay of just over three years was due to the obstacles created by the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria. The Patriarch threatened to excommunicate the entire paroikia if they refused to place the church under his protection. It was this threat which inhibited most Greeks in Alexandria from making a contribution towards the construction of the church. However, it was Michalis Tossitsas who broke the stalemate in 1847 by donating the land on which the church was to be built in 1847. Within two years the paroikia had raised 278,106.30 Egyptian piasters and the construction of the church proceeded. (Radopoulos, 1928: 19) The conflict with the Patriarch, however, was not resolved until the 28th of December, 1854.

The resolution of this socio-political and religious conflict was due to three factors: first, on the 1st of January, 1854, the Greek paroikia unilaterally declared itself a koinotita; second, in that same year, the
Greek Orthodox church in Greece unilaterally declared its independence from the Patriarchate in Istanbul; and third, on the 27th. of December, 1854, the executive council of the koinotita decided to pay an annual tribute to the Patriarchate which consisted of five hundred talaris. Thus, the Patriarch rescinded his threat of excommunication. The construction of the interior of the church was hence completed and its inauguration took place on the 25th of March, 1856, with the presence of the Patriarch, who was paid nine hundred and forty talaris for attending. (Anon, 1862: 14) The date is itself quite symbolic because it was the anniversary of the beginning of the Greek Revolution of 1821. The inauguration of the Evangelismos, as it was named, confirmed both the separation of civil society from the church, and the autonomous status of the Greek koinotita of Alexandria.

By the mid-1850s the Greek koinotita of Alexandria had achieved a high degree of socio-economic, religious and cultural autonomy within the confines of an Egyptian state. This was formalised by the official recognition of its internal statutes and regulations by both the Greek and Egyptian states. The community owned its own hospital, school, named after Michalis Tossitsas, and church, and all these institutions were funded and administered by its executive council. One of the most important concerns of the community was to ensure that it would be protected by the Capitulations. Thus, article seventeen of the statutes, of which there were twenty-two, stated that

*In the case that it is needed to protect any of the rights or interests of any of the koinotita's properties, the responsible administrators, or the community as a whole, should seek the intervention of the Greek Consulate under whose juridical jurisdiction should also be placed any legal suits against the community.* (my translation) (Greek Community, 1854: 12)
The reason for selecting the Greek Consulate was indicated in the covering letter accompanying the submission of the statutes and regulations. In the letter it was stated that

_The national properties of this koinotita have been placed under the juridical jurisdiction and political protection of the Greek Consulate-General. This has been approved by the executive council, over whom you, Mister Consul-General, preside, because you have already indicated your concern to protect this national property and also because a majority of the members are subjects of His Greek Majesty._ [my translation] (Radopoulos, 1928: 23)

It is clear from the covering letter that Michalis Tossitsas in his dual capacity as Greek Consul-General and President of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria played a central role in the establishment of this first Greek bourgeois socio-economic and cultural entity in Egypt. Unfortunately, several modern Greek historians have failed to realise the significance of his accomplishment. In an effort to substantiate the continuity of Hellenism in Egypt, Manolis Gialourakis, the most prominent contemporary historian of the Greeks in Egypt, noted that Michalis Tossitsas "...gave new breath to the community in Alexandria with his large contributions". [my translation] (Gialourakis, 1967: 287)

At no point in his seven hundred page study does he consider the significance of the new forms of socio-economic and political organisation initiated by Tossitsas. Thus, the transition from a demogerontia, which operated within the confines of the millet system and the Ottoman administration, to a paroikia and finally a koinotita, with a high degree of autonomy, is seen solely as reflecting different historical periods. In this respect these Greek historians share a similar methodological approach to that employed by historians of modern Egypt, such as P J Vatikiotis. The emphasis is on continuity rather than change and transformation, and so the specificities and dynamics of modern history, for both the Greeks in Alexandria and Egypt, fail to
emerge. (Glavanis, 1975) In such a methodological approach, of course, the historical significance of the establishment of the Greek community in Alexandria is not perceived.

Another reason which permits such historians to ignore the significance of the establishment of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria is that its members were exclusively Greek Orthodox Christians. The millet system also organised all Christians of a particular denomination into one socio-administrative unit. Thus, for these historians, there is no difference between the millet and the koinotita. What has been ignored is the fact that although representing the interests of the Greek Orthodox Christians in Alexandria, the internal organisation of the koinotita was based on bourgeois democratic principles. The executive council, which represented the interests of the entire community in matters relating to third parties (article two), was elected by the entire general assembly, where each member had one vote. These elections were both secret and based on the principle of simple majority (article four). Those elected to the executive council did not have the right to refuse their appointment (article five). They were elected for a term of three years, after which new elections had to take place (article three). Furthermore, the executive council elected its chairman, who was also the President of the community, and formally represented the entire community in all matters (article seven). (Greek Community, 1854 and Politis, 1929: 235)

The democratic principles adopted by the Greek koinotita of Alexandria constituted a pioneering step towards the establishment of bourgeois democracy even when compared to the organisation of other Greek communities in Europe at the time. For example, the founding statutes of the Greek community in Manchester, established in 1852 required a
minimum contribution of five sterling pounds per annum in order to ensure membership in the community. (Hadziiossif, 1980, 343) This condition prevented Greeks who were not wealthy from even joining the community and thus turned the Manchester Greek community into an elitist association. However, as the Alexandria Greek community developed throughout the nineteenth century, and different socio-economic and political trends started to emerge, reflecting changes in Egyptian society, similar oligarchic principles were also introduced. This constituted the basis of most internal disputes and will be commented on in the following sections.

Nevertheless, during the period under consideration, the organisation of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria exemplified the principles of a modern form of bourgeois democracy. It is for this reason that it has been suggested that the role and activities of Michalis Tossitsas, founder of the community, achieved significant importance with regards to the modern history of both the Greeks in the Diaspora and Egypt. Similarly, the establishment of the Greek koinotita of Alexandria represented a major socio-economic and political development which highlights change and transformation rather than continuity. Furthermore, given the close economic and political association between Michalis Tossitsas and Muhammad 'Ali, it can be argued that the establishment of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria reflected, in a specific form, many of the new trends and forces initiated by the latter. In many respects, Muhammad 'Ali, who was an active supporter of both Michalis Tossitsas and the Greek community in Alexandria, saw the Greeks in Egypt occupying a central role in his efforts to encourage the development of merchant capitalism in Egypt.
Thus, this first phase of the modern history of the Greeks in Egypt represented by the activities of the Greeks in Alexandria established in a concrete form the forces, and their inherent contradictions, which were to play a central role in its future development. This was made abundantly clear in 1854, when an external crisis, the Crimean War, challenged the very existence of the newly established Greek koinotita in Alexandria. Greece adopted a pro-Russian attitude to the extent that British and French troops landed in Pireus, while 'Abbas Hilmi, successor to Muhammad 'Ali, supported the Ottoman Sultan by sending twenty thousand troops and naval vessels to the Crimean front. Furthermore, after the death of Muhammad 'Ali, the Ottoman Sultan increased his influence in Egypt, and thus forced a rupture in diplomatic relations between Greece and Egypt. Michalis Tossitsas, in his capacity as Greek Consul-General was forced to return to Greece on the 29th of May, 1854. Not only did this put an end to the pioneering role and activities of the founder of the Greek community, but it meant that the Greek koinotita could no longer benefit from the protection of the Capitulations.

Furthermore, the representatives of the other European powers in Egypt, and especially the British Consul-General, took advantage of this situation and encouraged the Egyptian state to deport all Greeks who were Greek citizens. The ostensible reason for the attempt to expel the Greek merchants from Egypt was the rupture of diplomatic relations between the two countries. It was also, however, the first manifestation of the inherent contradictions between the privileges held by the Greek merchants in Egypt and the interests of an expanding European commercial capitalism, which itself had an ambivalent attitude towards these merchants. Thus the implications of this crisis, and the
departure of Michalis Tossitsas, had serious repercussions on the activities of the Greek community. The school teachers were deported and the school was reduced to only one class. Furthermore, due to the crisis, the community funds were reduced significantly because much of the property owned by Greek merchants was confiscated by the Egyptian state which saw them as enemies of the Ottoman Empire. (Tsirkas, 1973: 49) The financial crisis experienced by the community was such that the construction of the Evangelismos church had to be interrupted. (Radopoulos, 1928: 32)

Nevertheless, as indicated above several of the prominent Greek merchants in Alexandria were citizens of European countries. On the 17th of April, 1854, even before the departure of Tossitsas from Egypt, the Greek koinotita elected Stefanos Zizinias, a French citizen, as its new President and Petros Cavafy, a British citizen, as its Vice-President. It is indicative of the mercantilistic ideological nature of the community that at the moment of crisis Cavafy, who had taken on Greek citizenship in 1850, immediately re-activated his British citizenship in order to safeguard his own commercial interests and the political status of the Greek community. Furthermore, when Zizinias was elected President, Tossitsas, who was also his uncle, noted

*It is to you, my friend, that I give the responsibility to protect these ethnic [my emphasis] institutions, which in Gods name you should never abandon so that our efforts may not have been in vain. [my translation] (Tsirkas, 1973: 49)*

Tossitsas, as a Greek citizen, was ostensibly pro-Russian and Zizinias, as a French citizen, was pro-Ottoman in the Crimean conflict. Nevertheless, what united both men, in addition to family relations, was their mercantile interests, expressed in ethnic terms, rather than the current nationalistic rivalries taking place around them. In some
respects, the Greek koinotita saw itself as being above narrowly defined national loyalties and instead encouraged the universalism of merchant capital.

The crisis confronted by the Greek community in Alexandria did not last long. On the 13th of July, 1854, 'Abbas Hilmi was assassinated and according to Vatikiotis "...had left no appreciable mark on Egypt, except for a reputation as the dismantler of his grandfather's edifice". (Vatikiotis, 1969: 77) That edifice was Muhammad 'Ali's state monopolies. 'Abbas Hilmi's attempts to dismantle them was at the behest of Sir Murray, the British Consul-General. Sa'id Pasha, however, who replaced him, was a close friend of Ferdinand de Lesseps, the French Consul-General and who later was to be the man responsible for the construction of the Suez canal. This change of power set back British interests in Egypt, but the political status of the Greek community improved dramatically as its new President, Zizinias, was a French citizen and the Belgian Consul-General. This ability of the Greeks in Alexandria to exchange national loyalties and citizenships according to the prevailing circumstances provided the necessary political protection for the community and they were thus able to resume their activities.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that it was the wealthy Greek merchants of Alexandria who managed to survive the crisis of 1854. As indicated above, many of the ordinary Greeks in that city were either expelled or had their property confiscated. This exemplified, in a very specific manner, the class structure of the Greek community in Alexandria, composed as it was of a few prominent and wealthy merchants and a majority of petty-merchants, craftsmen, professionals and workers. The class nature of the koinotita had been obvious from as early as 1843, when the meeting of the paroikia at Saint Savas was attended by only
thirty-eight persons from a total Greek population estimated at about three thousand persons. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 89) It was the wealthy Greek merchants who made the financial contributions and gathered at Saint Savas to organise the manner in which these funds would be spent. Nevertheless, as one historian has noted

The socio-professional groups which constituted the [Greek] colony, under the hegemony of the large merchants, formed a coherent economic totality in which the complementarity and interdependence of interests was greater than the contradictions. This coherence at the economic level, however, did not prevent other aspects of social life in the Greek colony from being less united [homogeneous]. [my translation] (Hadziiossif, 1980: 357)

Greek petty-merchants, craftsmen and workers lived in Egyptian neighbourhoods, had social relations with Egyptians and even shared certain folk-religious beliefs. In Cairo, for example, the church of Saint George is visited until the present day by Greeks and Egyptian Muslims who believe in the ability of this Saint to protect sailors on the Nile and cure mental illness. In distinct contrast, however, the wealthy Greek merchants, along with other prominent European merchants and the European Consular corps, constituted a socio-economic category that had little to do with the rest of the European and Egyptian population. In many respects, this cosmopolitan socio-economic group was at the top of both the Egyptian and European social pyramid. This was quite evident in the urban residential patterns, and especially in Alexandria where the dichotomy between rich and poor, not withstanding ethnic or national origins, was most pronounced. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 358-9) The life style of these wealthy Greek merchants in Alexandria attracted the attention of most European visitors to Alexandria.

As is the case with all those who have recently attained social status, they (Greek wealthy merchants) try to legitimate their newly acquired wealth by acquiring noble titles and distinctions. They become consuls for several European countries like d'Anastasis [d'Anastasyl, Tossitsas, Zizinias and others; they purchase noble titles like Zizinias who became
a count; they call themselves Sir like Tossitsas. When their peasant origins are quite recent and they do not have a real family name, they overcome this [social] difficulty by adding the particle de in front of their father's christian name like Ioannis d'Anastasis.

Contacts with Occidentals are frequent and intended; their salons are open to the consular corps and distinguished visitors from Europe. The marriage of their children with Europeans is not frowned upon especially if it permits them to develop their contacts with the occidental bourgeoisie. They constitute "marriages of inclination and convenience" in the pure tradition of the nineteenth century bourgeoisie. The love of art is also part of this mode of living. These prominent merchants of Alexandria are either creators of works of art or collectors. At his death, Ioannis d'Anastasis, left to the Greek school in Alexandria a library consisting of fourteen hundred volumes among which there were several valuable items. It is Etienne [Stefanos] Zizinias who is the most prominent collector among the Greek merchants. His house, which was destroyed in the fires of 1882, holds a rich collection of books, ancient manuscripts, and antiquities from the Graeco-Egyptian [Hellenistic] period. Zizinias also constructed the grandest theatre in Alexandria. [my translation] (from Flaubert and other European travellers, quoted in Hadziillosf, 1980: 359-61)

In some respects, this social elite of Greek merchants in Alexandria constituted a socio-economic oligarchy around which many Greek petty-merchants gathered. They worked for these wealthy merchants and through this work they were able to accumulate sufficient funds in order to establish their own enterprises. Several of these petty-merchants eventually achieved a prominent socio-economic status within the Greek community and in Alexandria society in general. (Tsirkas, 1973: 66-7)

Thus, it is not in doubt that a degree of social mobility existed within the socio-economic pyramid that characterised the Greeks in Alexandria. George Averoff, who arrived in 1865 in Alexandria, although he had emigrated to Egypt in 1841, was the most prominent example of social mobility. Of course, part of this social mobility was simply due to the actual increase of the number of Greek merchants in Alexandria and the rapid transformation of the Egyptian economy.
An important aspect of this limited social mobility was that many Greeks in Alexandria preferred to establish their own enterprises than to remain as employees. This was primarily due to the fact that they were motivated by social considerations, and given the socio-economic characteristics of the Greek merchants who founded the koinotita, the prevalent perception of prominence and status was closely connected to individual achievement rather than corporate success. Later in the century, this aspect constituted one of the major factors that divided the Greeks in Alexandria. Nevertheless, during this early period of the history of the Greek community, these social and economic contradictions were still implicit rather than overt. The prevailing ideology at that time accepted the prerogative of the small group of wealthy merchants to control the community affairs. This was adequately expressed in a letter dated the 6th of May, 1845, by the Greek Consul-General, Michalis Tossitsas, who noted that "...without a closed and respected system of authority societies cannot live peacefully and in security". [my translation] (Foreign Affairs, 1845: 36-1)

This period of the history of the Greek community in Alexandria is then primarily characterised by an important, but implicit, socio-political contradiction. On the one hand, the community was concerned to emphasise its bourgeois democratic orientation in order to achieve a degree of autonomy from the restrictive and oligarchic structures that prevailed in the Ottoman Empire, the millet and demogerontia systems of socio-political and economic organisation. At the same time those Greek merchants who founded the koinotita were also concerned to maintain their privileged social and economic status with regard both to the rest of the Greeks in Alexandria and other European economic interests in Egypt. Given the nature of the economic developments during the era of
Muhammad 'Ali, this contradiction took on a socio-political dimension, but remained more or less submerged. It is the economic changes initiated by 'Abbas Hilmi as of 1849, the abolition of the state monopolies, and the political crisis of 1854 that added an economic dimension to this contradiction and also caused it to become a social reality among the Greeks in Alexandria. It was in the subsequent decades that these conflicts and contradictions more clearly showed themselves.
III. The Development of the Greek Community in Alexandria, 1854 - 1900

The crisis of 1854 affected the financial situation of most Greek merchants in Alexandria and thus also affected the financial status of the Greek koinotita. The accounts of the community for the period 1847 to 1855 show a negative balance of 319 Egyptian piasters, in the current balance sheet, and debts amounting to 547,921 Egyptian piasters. This was despite the fact that the current balance sheet for 1855 showed a positive balance of 20,306 Egyptian Piasters. (Radopoulos, 1928: 27-8) This dire financial situation was due to the fact that the 1854 crisis occurred at a time when the community had major expenses related to the construction of the Evangelismos church. The result, however, of these events and their concomitant financial implications was that the community was compelled to abandon one of the basic principles that had characterised its statutes during the early part of its history. In this sense the Greek community in Alexandria exemplified a central characteristic of all bourgeois democracies; they are constantly changing and are invariably flawed and class-biased.

In 1856, Stefanos Zizinias introduced an amendment to the statutes which gave the right to vote only to those members of the general assembly who had contributed a minimum of one hundred Egyptian piasters, and the right to be elected to the executive council to those members who had contributed a minimum of three hundred Egyptian piasters. The amendment, which also stated that these contributions had to be made in the year preceding the elections, was accepted by the executive council and the general assembly. (Anon, 1862: 21) Although the minimum contributions were not large, equivalent to approximately one and three pounds sterling at the time, a basic principle of the early years had been abandoned. Universal suffrage, of course, is not in itself a basic
principle of bourgeois democracy. On the contrary it is a right which has to be fought for from below as was the case, for example, of the working class in Britain or women in all European bourgeois democracies. What had taken place in the early years in the Greek community in Alexandria could be considered to be somewhat of an exception to the general situation in the nineteenth century. Thus, the abandonment of this principle in the mid-1850s does not in itself suggest a reversal of the general bourgeois democratic orientation of the community.

The introduction of this amendment had an immediate effect on the participation of many Alexandria Greeks in the administration of the affairs of the community, and thus its exceptional democratic nature. In 1857, for example, only one hundred and fifty persons paid the minimum contribution that would enable them to vote, while eighty-seven of those paid the minimum that would enable them to be elected to the executive council. Given that the Greeks in Alexandria numbered about three thousand at the time, the effects of this amendment are quite clear. Nevertheless, the introduction of the amendment did not seem to affect the financial status of the community. This is clear from the accounts of the community for that year which indicate that the total sum contributed by the one hundred and fifty persons amounted to 136,968 Egyptian piasters. This was due to the fact that several prominent Greek merchants had contributed considerably more than the minimum required by the statutes. For example, the Zizinias and the Cassavetis brothers contributed ten thousand Egyptian piasters respectively, Fraghiadis, Valentis and Natsios had contributed six thousand Egyptian piasters respectively, and Nicolopoulos, Dimitriou, Ghiralopoulos, Trapentzalis and Sinadinos had contributed four thousand Egyptian piasters respectively. (Hadziiossif, 1980: 341-2)
The large financial contributions from some of the wealthy Greek merchants in Alexandria permitted the koinotita to resume almost immediately its objective to develop its various institutions. By September, 1855, the school was once more in session with all grades functioning smoothly. In that same year they also established the first school for girls. Pursuing its educational and cultural objectives, the koinotita set up a five-person committee in 1856 in order to organise the establishment of what they called The Alexandria Library within the premises occupied by the boys' school. That same year the library received its first donation of two hundred and ninety-three volumes from Michalis Tossitsas who was then in Athens. (Radopoulos, 1928: 39)

Nevertheless, the implications of having to rely on other European powers for political protection were quick to appear. When diplomatic relations between Egypt and Greece were resumed in 1855, a new Consul-General was appointed. Dimitris Rizos, the new Consul-General, immediately tried to re-impose the authority of the Greek state in the running of the community affairs by attempting to appoint himself as President. He argued that Zizinias and Cavafy, as foreign citizens, could not occupy such posts in an association which was formally Greek. As a means of blackmailing the community into accepting his authority, he even suggested to the Greek government on the 24th of June, 1856 that there was no need for Greek ships to continue to pay the special consular fee upon departure from Alexandria, which was used by the community to meet some of its hospital expenses. (Foreign Affairs, 1856: 36-1)

The fact that Rizos was also Greek Consul-General was not too disconcerting for the Greek community and they might have accepted him as President in the same tradition of Michalis Tossitsas, who had also
held both posts. Furthermore, at their 1843, meeting the community had agreed to place its property under the political protection of the Greek Consulate. What was a problem, however, given their social elitism, was the fact that he was not a prosperous merchant from Alexandria, but a simple Greek Consular official from Greece. It was at that moment that the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria seized the opportunity and decided to re-exercise his authority, derived from the Ottoman millet system, and announced that he was appointing the President of the community. The potential involvement of the Patriarch, who was also the legal representative of the Ottoman Sultan, alarmed the Greek community and at a special meeting on the 31st of May, 1857, they dismissed Zizinias and Cavafy and appointed Rizos as the new President. (Anon, 1862: 22)

The Patriarch, however, pursued his attempts to impose his authority and the old conflict of interests between civil society and church re-emerged. The situation developed to such an extent that Sa'id Pasha, ruler of Egypt, appointed a committee composed of Ioannis d'Anastasy, Consul-General of Sweden, Mr Geren, Consul-General of Russia and Dimitris Rizos in order to resolve the issue. No member of this committee was willing to see the Patriarch, and by definition the Ottoman Sultan, regain authority and power over non-Muslims in Egypt. The committee, therefore, recommended to Sa'id Pasha that, according to the statutes of the Greek koinotita, the Patriarch had no right to appoint the President of the Greek koinotita. Sa'id Pasha accepted their recommendation and ordered the Patriarch not to intervene in the affairs of the koinotita. (Anon, 1862: 23) Thus, inadvertently, the statutes and regulations of the Greek koinotita were formally approved
de facto by the Egyptian state, but at the cost of accepting Greek political involvement in its affairs.

This new crisis confronted by the community was primarily the result of two factors. First, there was a technical issue which related to the fact that the 1854 statutes and regulations, emphasising the autonomy of the Greek koinotita of Alexandria, had not been formally approved by either the Egyptian and Greek governments or the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Alexandria. As it has already been mentioned above, the Greeks in Alexandria had unilaterally declared their autonomy from both Greece and the Patriarchate. They had submitted their statutes and regulations to the Greek Consul-General, Michalis Tossitsas, but he had not forwarded them anywhere. Second, there was a more fundamental issue which related to loyalty of the koinotita. Both Greece and the Patriarchate assumed that the community, composed as it was of primarily Greek citizens and exclusively of Greek Orthodox Christians, should come under their political and religious jurisdictions, respectively. The Greek koinotita of Alexandria, however, had a primary loyalty towards their own self-interest namely, the expansion and consolidation of merchant capital rather than towards any specific nationalistic or religious entity. Nevertheless, the crisis of 1857 had at least one positive outcome for the community. Its legal existence was formally recognised by the Egyptian state.

This conflict between civil society and the church developed into another major crisis in February, 1862, when Rizos was re-called and a new Consul-General, Sotiris Charalambis, was appointed. On the 16th of March, 1862, the community held elections in order to elect a replacement for Rizos. Many Greeks, who had lost the right to vote due to the Zizinias amendment of 1856, demanded that the community abide by
the statutes of 1854, and especially article four, which gave the right to all Greeks in Alexandria to vote. The executive council insisted on abiding by the Zizinias amendment and was forced to postpone the elections. However, the two hundred and thirty persons who supported the 1854 statutes remained and elected a new executive council which they called the Council of the Graeco-Egyptian Community Elected Freely by All the People. They then submitted the names to the Patriarch and asked him to approve them as the new executive council. On that same day, the old executive council re-appointed itself and elected Sotiris Charalambis as its new President. This executive council then relied upon article seventeen of the 1854 statutes, which placed all community property under the political protection of the Greek Consulate, demanding that the Greek Consul-General evict the other council from the chamber. The confrontation turned violent and the Egyptian state had to send an army detachment to maintain peace. (Anon, 1862: 25)

The crisis quickly developed into a confrontation between the Greek Consulate and the Patriarchate as to who had the legitimate authority to supervise and control the Greek community in Alexandria. Furthermore, what was also at stake was the control of the property of the Greek community which was quite considerable and valuable. After lengthy negotiations between the Greek Consulate and the Patriarchate, it was agreed that new elections would take place. Thus, under Egyptian military supervision general elections took place on the 30th of March, 1862, and about fifteen hundred Greeks from Alexandria attended. Of those, thirteen hundred actually voted to nullify both elections that had taken place earlier and then elected the Greek Consul-General, Charalambis, as the new President. They also elected an executive council and voted for an amendment to the statutes which affirmed that
the President of the community would always be the current Greek Consul-General. (Anon, 1862: 36)

The Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria had suffered a second defeat, but the Greek community of Alexandria had re-introduced the principle of universal suffrage. The conflict between civil society and the church, however, had yet to be resolved. The following year the Greek Consulate and the Patriarchate reached an understanding which was to the benefit of the Greek community. The Consulate agreed to forego its right to appoint each new Consul-General as President of the community if the Patriarchate formally recognised the autonomy of the koinotita. Thus, the Patriarchate formally recognised the Greek community's statutes and regulations of 1854 on the 18th of February, 1863. (Radopoulos, 1928: 34) When Charalambis was re-called to Athens, the Greek community elected Sofoklis Konstantinidis as its new President on the 2nd of July, 1863. (Radopoulos, 1928: 39) Konstantinidis was an Alexandria based merchant, without much wealth or social status, but his election initiated a process which was to culminate in 1887 with the formal recognition of the autonomy of the Greek community by the Greek state.

Nevertheless, this latest crisis confronted by the community had been resolved with two significant gains. First, the autonomy of the koinotita had been formally recognised by the Patriarchate and thus the conflict between civil society and the church had finally been resolved in favour of the former. Second, the community had confirmed once more a principle of bourgeois democracy which was still absent in many capitalist West European states at the time, the right of all members to participate in the elections of the President and the executive council. This gave the community the necessary legitimacy which permitted it to
pursue its bourgeois objectives of controlling the church. In 1866, the Alexandria Patriarch died and the Greek community of Alexandria reminded the Patriarchate in Istanbul of the fact that

> for centuries it has been the accepted procedure of the Alexandria Patriarchate that the Patriarch is elected by the priests and the lay population of the Patriarchate without the involvement of any other Orthodox church. [my translation]

(Anon, n.d.: 3)

Given the fact that the Alexandria community had emerged with considerable wealth and power after the cotton boom years in Egypt, the Istanbul Patriarchate accepted their recommendation and appointed Nicanoras as the new Patriarch. Within a year, however, the new Patriarch suffered a stroke and was deemed by the community to be incompetent to continue with his duties. Thus, the community asked the Istanbul Patriarchate to remove Nicanoras from office. The Alexandria Patriarch, however, refused to step down, claiming that the traditional practice had been for all Patriarchs to serve until their death. Negotiations between the Greek community in Alexandria and the Istanbul Patriarchate lasted until July, 1870, when the community managed to receive the approval of the former for their new Patriarch, Sofronios.

(Anon, n.d.: 8-12; Radopoulos, 1928: 35-6) Thus, by 1870, the Greek koinotita of Alexandria had also established the right to remove from office a Patriarch whom they deemed incompetent.

This was a major achievement which expressed the extent to which the secular authority of the community had by now overshadowed the vestiges of ecclesiastical authority and overturned the millet principle of organising non-Muslims in the Ottoman Empire. For, whereas in the millet system, it was the Patriarch who organised and controlled the community, by 1870 it was the community which controlled the Patriarchate in Alexandria. The jurisdiction of the Alexandria
Patriarchate, moreover extended throughout Africa and, as such, the
influence of the Alexandria community also extended beyond the confines
of a single city. Thus, in less than two decades, the Greek koinotita
in Alexandria had confirmed its secular identity, received formal
recognition from the Egyptian state and extended its influence over all
other Greek Orthodox Christians in Africa. Nevertheless, by virtue of
its location within the Egyptian state, it remained politically tied to
Greece due to the fact that it had to rely on Greek Consular political
protection under the system of the Capitulations.

Encouraged by its other achievements, the community decided to challenge
the authority of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria. When its President,
Konstantinidis, resigned and left for Britain, the community elected its
own new President, Theodoros Rallis, on the 6th of May, 1871.
(Radopoulos, 1928: 46) As it will be recalled, however, the meeting of
the 30th of March, 1862, had confirmed the right of the current Greek
Consul-General to be appointed President of the community, and it was
commonly accepted that Konstantinidis, who was a small merchant in
Alexandria, had been elected President solely for the purpose of
resolving the conflict between the Consulate and the Patriarchate with
regard to whom would control the community. No one doubted that the
Greek Consul-General was the effective power that controlled the
community during Konstantinidis' tenure. (Tsirkas, 1973: 44) Thus, the
election of Theodoros Rallis constituted a major challenge to the
prerogatives of the current Greek Consul-General. Rallis was a
prominent and wealthy merchant in Alexandria who would not allow himself
to be controlled by a Consular official.

The ability of the community to appoint its own President, who was
independent of the influence of the Greek Consulate, was to some extent
an indication of the new power and influence achieved by the Alexandria merchants during the cotton boom period. This wealth also contributed to the consolidation of the power of these merchant families and the spread of their universal mercantile and bourgeois ideology within the community. It was an ideology which was reproduced in the schools run by the community and in most of the Greek newspapers produced in Alexandria. Its essence was articulated by the father of Greek journalism in Egypt, Dionisios Oikonomopoulos, in a speech given on the 25th of March, 1876, the fifty-fifth anniversary of the Greek Revolution of 1821.

*The mission of Hellenism in Egypt has always been peaceful and its influence on this hospitable country has been moral. Such is also the position of Hellenism today. What it has founded, if we look at it carefully this moment, has been very moral, and as for its achievements they have been purely cultural. We hope to attract the love and consideration of all with whom we live here, especially the indigenous people. We have the rightful ambition to occupy the prominent position is due to our numerical superiority and to our trustworthy and intelligent activities. We are inflamed by the desire to contribute to the illumination and ethics of the indigenous people who are our gracious hosts. [my translation] (quoted in Tsirka, 1973: 45)*

The *mission civilisatrice* ideological dimension is abundantly clear in the above quotation. Oikonomopoulos, however, was also expressing the fear felt by many in the Greek community in Alexandria that their privileged status might be eroded. It was in 1876 that Egypt had been declared bankrupt and Britain and France had formalised their control over her financial affairs through the establishment of the Caisse de la Dette Publique and her juridical affairs through the establishment of the Mixed Courts. Superior and more powerful European finance capital was challenging the prerogatives of Greek merchant capital in Alexandria. As indicated above in chapter two, Rallis himself had accumulated his wealth and achieved his social status by cooperating
with British finance capital. The ambition of the Greek community in Alexandria that they might control the entire Egyptian economy and thus extend their economic activities throughout Africa had been seriously challenged. In fact, it is possible to suggest that by 1876, the ambition expressed in Oikonomopoulos' speech was purely rhetorical. With the British military occupation of 1882, even the rhetoric came to an end.

The changes in the status of the Alexandria Greek community were also quite evident in the city itself. As we have seen, prior to 1882, Alexandria was a prosperous city whose commercial life was to a large extent controlled by Greek merchants. This was documented by several European travellers to Egypt, one of whom, Edmond About of French citizenship, visited the city at the end of the 1860s and noted that

Many European nations are represented in the economic life of Alexandria by shops that are just as respectable as they are grand. Greece holds the first place and then Italy and then us [France]. [my translation] (About, 1869: 399)

Prior to his arrival in Alexandria, as a special guest of Isma'il Pasha, About had worked as a teacher at the French school in Athens. When he observed the Greeks in Alexandria and compared them to those he had met in Athens, he appears to have been surprised at their activities and success, and remarked that "this small Greek nation is extraordinary, for it works and succeeds everywhere except in its own country". [my translation] (About, 1869: 398) The difference between the Greeks in Alexandria and those in Greece was not limited solely to economic activities. It was particularly noticeable in the cultural sphere.

The nature of this cultural difference is quite evident in the correspondence between Konstantinos Cavafy, well known poet and son of the Vice-President of the Greek community in the mid-1850s, and Mikes
Rallis, son of the President of the Greek community in the 1870s and early 1880s. In June 1882, due to the deterioration of the situation in Alexandria, Cavafy had gone to Istanbul and Rallis to Athens. From their correspondence, in English, it is clear that they saw Alexandria as being a cultural pioneer in comparison to Athens and Istanbul. In fact, Rallis seems to have had very little respect for his fellow Greek students at Athens University whom he characterised as "...having as much culture as a chunk of wood". (Peridis, 1948: 36) For both, it was the cultural achievements of the Greeks in Alexandria that were being used for comparison.

Both Cavafy and Rallis returned to Alexandria in 1885 and found that it had been transformed during their three year absence. The changed condition of the city was also noticed by ordinary Greek professionals living and working in Alexandria. Zangarolas, Director of the Greek hospital, in a letter dated the 22nd of August, 1882 addressed to his friend Vlassopoulou, who was in Athens, noted that

Alexandria, my dear friend, is a pile of rubble and practically no family [aristocratic] lives here. I have no doubt that it will be reconstructed, especially if they [the British] pay for the damages, without which Alexandria has been destroyed for ever, and I will be among the first to leave when I find employment elsewhere. These days I barely visit two patients per day and of these, few actually pay. [my translation] (quoted in Tsirkas, 1973: 153)

The prevailing chaos in and physical destruction of Alexandria seem to have affected Mikes Rallis, who on a business trip to Britain in 1885, wrote to Konstantinos Cavafy, who was now in Alexandria, that "...I would not want to return to Egypt if you were not there". (Peridis, 1948: 42) This is in quite sharp contrast to their correspondence in 1882, when Rallis talked of Alexandria as exemplifying progressive bourgeois culture. The overall desperate situation of the city also
affected Cavafy and it is reflected in two poems that he published in August, 1886, *Vakhikon* and *The Poet and the Muse*. Both poems express pessimism and hopelessness, and according to Stratis Tsirkas, they are the only poems from among the many that the poet wrote which express such a mood. "In *The Poet and the Muse*, Cavafy writes,

...dreams they are, I feel, glory and virtue'

The earth is a dark sphere, cold and deceitful [my translation] (Tsirkas, 1973: 153)

Alexandria in the 1880s was a city in ruin in which the British occupation forces were free to do what they pleased. The effects of an occupation army on the socio-cultural life of the city can be imagined. An anonymous letter written in September, 1886, in the columns of a Greek newspaper in Alexandria, *Metarithmisis*, expressed the feelings of many Greeks in that city when it noted that "...Muhammad 'Ali square - the most aristocratic - has been transformed into a love bazaar". [my translation] (quoted in Tsirkas, 1973: 165)

The commercial prosperity and activities of the city had also been affected by the 1882 British military occupation. The business activities of the Greek community of Alexandria, which had been admired by visitors to the city in the past, were also in ruins. The socio-economic elite of the community, however, was quick to recognise who were the new masters in Egypt, and as early as November, 1882, a committee of several prosperous Greek merchants and financiers was organised to discuss the situation. The committee composed of the most prominent and wealthy Greeks in the city, which included Sinadinos, Rallis, Antoniadis, Zangarolas, Giousios, Averoff, Salvagos and Zervoudachis, met and after protracted discussions decided to take advantage of the fact that Gladstone was reputed to be a phil-Hellene.
It was agreed, therefore, to send a telegram to Gladstone congratulating him on Britain's successful occupation of Egypt, and a copy was published in a Greek journal produced in Alexandria, Esperos. The committee was rewarded for its efforts by the fact that they and many other Greeks in Alexandria received considerable sums from the Egyptian government, by then under the tutelage of Lord Crümer, for the so-called damages caused by the Egyptian "mobs" (sic) during the events of 1882. (Tsirkas, 1973: 154)

It is clear from the Greek newspapers produced in Alexandria at the time that the British occupation forces used the issue of compensation as a means of gaining friends and supporters among the foreign socio-economic elite in the city. Given the stagnation of the Egyptian economy at the time, the compensation, which in total was reputed to have reached four million Egyptian pounds, was one of the few mechanisms by which merchants and financiers could hope to survive the difficult period. According to the letters sent by Mikes Rallis to Konstantinos Cavafy, corruption was at its highest with regard to this issue. For example, although the deadline for submitting applications to the appropriate committee was the 8th of May, 1883, and about eight and a half thousand applications were received, by March, 1884, the number of applications had increased to nine thousand eight hundred and eighty-four. (Peridis, 1948: 41-5) Among those who had submitted an application for compensation was Menandros Zizinias, son of Stefanos Zizinias the President of the Greek community in the mid-1850s, whose property had suffered extensive damages. Nevertheless, because he had refused to sign the telegram that was sent to Gladstone by the socio-economic elite of the Greek community, he received nothing. Zizinias was a French citizen and critical of the role and activities of the British in Egypt.
since 1882. Without compensation and his property ruined, therefore, Menandros Zizinias was forced to declare bankruptcy and so ended the history of one of the founding families of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria. (Tsirkas, 1973: 154)

The misuses and political manipulation of the issue of compensation in Alexandria can be illustrated further by reference to a few more examples from the Greek community in that city. A Greek merchant, who was still at school in 1882, received 101,757 franks in 1886, as compensation for the destruction of his stock when he was just twenty years old. In another case, a Greek coffee-shop owner who had died on the Greek island of Chios in 1880 received sixteen thousand franks for damages to his shop. A young Greek priest, George Leventakis, at the Evangelismos church requested just over five thousand franks for the destruction of his furniture. In decision number 276, the evaluator, Dedes, another Greek, remarked "I would have given him 3,000 franks and I believe that he should consider himself very lucky. It is much more than the value of a priest's furniture". [my translation] (quoted in Tsirkas, 1973: 162-3) Furthermore, it should also be noted that most of the members of the committee evaluating these applications for compensation were Greeks from Alexandria. As for the final decision regarding the actual sum to be paid to the claimant, it was made by two persons in the service of the Egyptian government, an Englishmen named Achlers and his assistant, a Greek, named Nikos Cambas. Cambas, who was a judge in Alexandria in 1882, was eventually to become one of wealthiest Greeks in that city. (Tsirkas, 1973: 163)

It was in this context of economic chaos, corruption and physical destruction that the Greek koinotita in Alexandria held its elections in 1884. Theodoros Rallis was re-elected President and George Averoff and
Konstantinos Zervoudachis were elected Vice-Presidents. It is the election of Zervoudachis and of three other members of the executive council, however, that produced the first concrete signs that the community was about to experience important socio-economic and political changes. A group of prominent Alexandria financiers who had close economic and political relations with British capital were elected for the first time. This group, whose life histories have been presented above in chapter two, consisted of Zervoudachis, Benakis, Salvagos and Sinadinos. (Radopoulos, 1928: 51) Furthermore, all four, who had signed the telegram to Gladstone, eventually benefited enormously from the financial compensation. Admittedly, Rallis and Averoff had also signed the telegram, but it would appear that they had done so in order to safeguard their personal fortunes and to protect the interests of the koinotita, given the new status quo prevailing in Egypt. Zervoudachis, however, was knighted by Queen Victoria, Salvagos and Benakis were close personal friends of Lord Cromer, and Sinadinos was the most prominent representative of British finance capital in Egypt.

Having secured their position on the executive council, the four financiers used their British contacts in order to facilitate the favourable resolution of outstanding applications for compensation by many members of the Greek community. This enhanced their power base within the community and on the 4th of November, 1885, they forced the resignation of Rallis. Tilegrafos, an anti-British Greek newspaper in Alexandria, in its issue dated the 19th of November, 1885, commented on his resignation and in particular on his resignation letter in which he noted that he was resigning "...due to the rapid deterioration of my health and my inability to attend the meetings of the community". [my translation] Tilegrafos, went on to point out that it was strange that
the executive council required eleven days to respond to Rallis' resignation letter and when it did respond, it did not wish him a speedy recovery. (Tilegrafos, 1885: 1) Clearly, the newspaper editor did not believe the excuse given by Rallis for his resignation and suspected intrigue. This is partially confirmed by the fact that Rallis lived an active life for another five years and according to a pro-British Greek newspaper in Alexandria, Tachydromos, dated the 1st of November, 1890, he died the day before from "...an unexpected and sudden heart attack". [my translation] (Tachydromos, 1890: 1)

It is not possible to present an account of what transpired within the executive council which led to Rallis' resignation or the reasons that caused them to take eleven days to respond to his letter. The records of the executive council show nothing, and the numerous accounts of the history of the Greek community in Alexandria, including those of Gialourakis (1967), Politis (1929) and Radopoulos (1928), just mention that Rallis resigned. Furthermore, the Greek press in Alexandria was either pro-British or was unable to publish accounts that might upset the new political status quo. This was because the British had re-introduced a press censorship law that had first been promulgated in 1881 by the pro-British Tawfiq Pasha but abolished by 'Urabi in 1882. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 181) Tilegrafos, for example, which had simply insinuated that something was behind Rallis' resignation, had already been fined several times for its criticism of British policies in Egypt. (Tsirkas, 1973: 212) Fearing that it might be forced to cease publication, as had happened even with newspapers such as Le Bosphore, which had strong French government backing, the Tilegrafos was reluctant to antagonise Lord Cromer openly. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 181)
One of the few sources that reflect what was happening during this period is the poetry, articles and notes of the Alexandria poet, Konstantinos Cavafy. As indicated above, Mikes Rallis was both Cavafy’s closest friend and the son of Theodoros Rallis. Furthermore, Theodoros Rallis was one of the early Greek emigrants to Alexandria who was also a close friend of Cavafy’s father. Konstantinos Cavafy, therefore, was well placed to know what was happening in the Greek community. In his poem, Vakhikon, written at the time, but published in 1886, the poet writes about a prevailing atmosphere of "...envy, disgrace, hate, slander and devilry". (my translation) (Tsirkas, 1973: 156)

Nevertheless, when elections were held in order to select a new President, it was Averoff who was elected. The four pro-British financiers had to settle with Salvagos being elected Vice-President. (Radopoulos, 1928: 52) Given that the statutes and regulations of the community enabled all Greeks in Alexandria to vote, it would appear that the majority of these Greeks were by no means pro-British. Thus, once more, at a moment of crisis the integrity and autonomy of the koinotita was preserved. During Averoff’s tenure as President, the conflict within the community between the pro-British and anti-British factions intensified and manifested itself in all its activities. By the end of Averoff’s tenure in 1899, however, the pro-British faction had emerged victorious.

The first clear manifestation of this conflict appeared in 1887 when the community embarked on a massive effort to collect financial contributions that would enable it to repay debts that had been accumulating since 1882. The nature of these debts is itself a problematic issue because there is practically no detailed information in the community accounts that can help explain their origin. An
examination of the community accounts during this period indicates that it had spent a total of 23,580 Egyptian pounds in order to reconstruct the property that was damaged during the bombardment of Alexandria. The community had received, however, 18,516 Egyptian pounds in compensation from the Egyptian government, so it only needed to raise 5,064 Egyptian pounds. The community seems to have raised the necessary funds to cover the difference, because the accounts for 1886 show a positive balance of 6,443 Egyptian pounds. (Tsirkas, 1973: 203) The accounts for 1887, however, show a negative balance of 19,740 Egyptian pounds and most historians accept this as being the debt of the community without any explanation of its origin. (Radopoulos, 1928: 52) Furthermore, there is no indication of any major construction or other expenditure that would account for such a large deficit within one year.

Nevertheless, the records indicate that community property was about to be seized by the banks when Averoff decided to embark on his effort to collect financial contributions. (Politis, 1929: 287) An examination of the list of contributions makes clear the developing divisions within the community. Whereas Averoff donated ten thousand Egyptian pounds, the four financiers, who were among the wealthiest persons in the city, contributed insignificant sums. Zervoudachis contributed sixteen hundred Egyptian pounds, Benakis four hundred Egyptian pounds, Salvagos, who was also Vice-President, contributed two hundred Egyptian pounds, and Sinadinos, along with his brother, contributed just eighty Egyptian pounds. A further examination of the list of donors indicates that many other Greeks, some of whom were not very wealthy, had contributed sums ranging in the hundreds or even thousands. (Tsirkas, 1973: 204)

It is clear from this list of contributions that the pro-British group of financiers did not see financial contributions to the Greek community
as necessary in order to enhance their social and political status. There prominence and status were derived primarily through their close association with British financial and political structures in the city. Averoff, however, despite his late arrival in Alexandria, belonged to a socio-economic group which identified with the founders of the Greek community and saw large financial contributions to the communal efforts of the community constituting both an ethnic obligation and as a means of enhancing his social status in the city.

The developing socio-cultural and political conflict within the koinotita was reflected among all Greeks in Alexandria. George Kipiadis, a lawyer by profession, and an advocate of the rights of working class Greeks in the city, characterised the particularities of this conflict when he discussed the increasing impoverishment and hunger of the Greek workers in Alexandria in 1887.

*We (Greeks) are so numerous in Egypt and with so much capital, but do not want to provide jobs and food to the hundreds of able people who due to the lack of jobs absorb the suffocating atmosphere of the coffee-shops and wilt away and recently are also wilting away physically due to hunger.* (my translation) *(Kipiadis, 1892: 74)*

Kipiadis, of course, was aware that the many institutions of the Greek community not only provided jobs for many poor Greeks, but they also fed, clothed, educated and healed the poor for free. Nevertheless, in this account of the 1887 crisis, Kipiadis refrained from attacking the pro-British socio-economic group directly. His criticism was primarily directed at the economic policies being implemented by Lord Cromer in Egypt. This is clear from another account concerning the economic crisis facing Alexandria in which he makes suggestions as to how to deal with the increasing unemployment among Greek workers in Alexandria. He
argued that the wealth of the prosperous Greeks could be used to establish

...industrial enterprises, on the basis of shares, and especially thread and cloth industries, which would produce large profits since these commodities are widely consumed locally and in a country where cotton is produced in large quantities. [my translation] (Kipiadis, 1892: 73)

Kipiadis was well aware that Lord Cromer’s economic policies actively discouraged the establishment of any industry in Egypt that might compete with the Lancashire textile mills. It is for this reason that his suggestions were meant to embarrass the pro-British group of Greek financiers whose financial enterprises implemented Cromer's policies. When Kipiadis decided to publish all his previous articles in a single volume in 1892, he wrote a new introduction in which his criticism of the financiers was more direct. The volume was dedicated to "...the great ethnic benefactor George Averoff" who

...alone in this critical period for the Greeks, while others have become wealthy or in the process of accumulating wealth...and are only concerned about themselves and act for themselves...he [Averoff] acts with vigour and maintains exceedingly well the schools, etc... [my translation] (Kipiadis, 1892: 14)

In his conclusion to the volume, Kipiadis poses a rhetorical question, "...what will happen to the Greeks, for people like George Averoff are not born very often". [my translation] (Kipiadis, 1892: 77)

That Kipiadis, who prided himself as representing the interests of the Greek working class, would support and praise in public Averoff, one of the wealthiest men in Alexandria, raises some interesting issues about the nature of the socio-cultural and political conflict being fought within the community. The conflict was such that it suppressed class antagonisms among the Greeks in Alexandria and instead highlighted socio-political differences. This permitted champions of the Greek
working class to see the possibility of an alliance with men like Averoff primarily because they were anti-British. This is clear in the writings of another champion of the Greek working class, Ioannis Gikas, who was a school teacher by profession. In his discussion of the particular characteristics of the two groups that dominated the internal politics of the community, he referred to the anti-British group as

Polyglots, and all with fine manners, in a period in Alexandria when illiteracy was predominant, they had easily been able to get acquainted with the powerful rulers of Egypt [Muhammad 'Ali] to whom they owed among many things their privileged and aristocratic status. It is for this reason that the Greek who emigrates here in order to earn a living...although deep inside he hated them...he also blessed them, gave them respect and called them protoclassatoi [first class families]. [my translation] (Gikas, 1950: 41)

As to the second group which was pro-British, he characterised them as

Grandees of wealth yes, but mostly upstarts. These defteroclassatoi [second class families] with their resourceful minds and indomitable eagerness have managed to serve the rulers [Tawfiq Pasha who was pro-British] so successfully and with devotion, but for their own interests, so that they became indispensable for so many [economic] affairs, from which many of them live like Croesus. [my translation] (Gikas, 1950: 42)

It is clear that Gikas writing almost fifty years after Kipiadis, shared a similar perspective on the socio-economic and political divisions within the community. Furthermore, both writers seem to indicate that the Greek working class, for purposes of employment at least, respected these protoclassatoi families. The reason, of course, is quite obvious. It was wealthy merchants like Tossitsas, Stournaras, Zizinias, Rallis, Averoff, etc. who established and maintained the various institutions of the koinotita from which the poor Greeks received a number of social, economic, educational and health benefits. This is in addition to the fact that the economic system within which the protoclassatoi operated, indigenous mercantile capitalism, allowed for a certain degree of social mobility. The pro-British financiers, however, did not contribute to
the maintenance of the community institutions and also functioned within an economic system which did not allow for individual initiative or social mobility, European-controlled finance capital. It should also be noted that the indigenous mercantile system that characterised the economic ventures of the protoclassatoi relied very heavily on personal contacts and family relations. Finance capital, however, operated through an impersonal system whose rules were set in European finance capitals and did not allow for family or ethnic considerations.

In several respects the conflict that emerged within the community in the 1880s was similar to the challenge directed at the community in 1854. In 1854, however, Egypt's dependence was still in its early stages and the Greek commercial bourgeoisie of Alexandria was able to survive. In the 1880s, Egypt was under British military occupation and there was very little that the Greek commercial bourgeoisie could do to defend its privileges and interests. This situation was exacerbated even further by the fact that Tricoupis, Greek Prime Minister at the time, was also pro-British and supported the Greek financial oligarchy in Alexandria.

Nevertheless, as the old mercantile bourgeoisie saw its status being eroded, it turned to its ethnic origins and identity for inspiration and security. During Averoff's tenure as President, the community experienced a major expansion in the field of culture and education. In 1890 he constructed the first Greek gymnasium in Alexandria and guaranteed its future with an endowment which generated four hundred Egyptian pounds annually. Similarly, in 1896 he established a second girls school on land that he had purchased. (Radopoulos, 1928: 54-5) As
to his contributions towards education in Greece, they have already been discussed above in chapter two.

One of the results of this emphasis on ethnic identity was that in 1887, Averoff was instrumental in ensuring that the statutes and regulations of the koinotita were altered in such a way so as to emphasise its Greek identity. The new statutes and regulations were approved by the Greek government with a Royal Decree issued on the 18th of June, 1887. (Radopoulos, 1928: 52) Henceforth, the community was called The Greek Community of Alexandria, and thus it lost its universal character which had been an important characteristic of its early period. As of 1888, only Greek citizens could be members of the community, and soon the Greek koinotita in Alexandria came to be seen by most Egyptians as just another example of the European presence in their country. Ironically, after the Greek mercantile bourgeoisie had lost its universalism and had in effect been defeated, they tried to challenge the financiers in 1896 by establishing The Bank of Athens. This last effort by the protoclassatoi failed for reasons that already have been discussed in some detail in chapter four. By the end of the century, the Greek financiers would be able to take over the community entirely.

It is of some interest to note here that when the Greek bourgeoisie in Greece made its first attempt to take over the state in 1897, the Revolution of Ghoudi, it was the British who gave them all the needed support in order to overthrow the pro-Russian and pro-French Greek aristocracy. Under the dual banners of liberalism and philhellenism, British capital actively supported Greek merchants and entrepreneurs to re-structure the Greek economy. In Egypt, however, Lord Cromer waged an endless battle against the Greek community in the cause of defending the Egyptian peasant. This apparent paradox in British attitudes towards
the Greeks can only be explained by the different British interests in Egypt and Greece. In Greece, British finance capital recruited the Greek bourgeoisie as its ally, while in Egypt, the well-established Greek community represented a direct challenge to the interests of British bankers and financiers.

Averoff died on the 28th of July, 1899, and according to the statutes of the community, an election had to take place in order to elect the new President. The campaign for these community elections lasted until March, 1900, and was one of the most bitter and heated election campaigns ever witnessed by the community. The main factions were Konstantinos Salvagos, representing the pro-British Greek financiers, and those who had supported Averoff while in office. From the very start, the Greek press in Alexandria was very critical of Salvagos, especially since his role in preventing the establishment of The Bank of Athens had just been made public. Salvagos, however, enlisted the support of a French newspaper in Alexandria, La Reforme, which published an article on the forthcoming Greek community elections on the 4th of August, 1899, in which it noted that

All the Greeks that we have questioned are in agreement. The name that they all suggest is that of Mister Konstantinos Salvagos, whose dedication was once more proven during the recent hygienic campaign against the epidemic. [my translation] (La Reforme, 1899: 2)

The fact that Salvagos had relied upon a French newspaper to campaign for his candidacy was to prove most unfortunate. The following day, Liatsis, the most respected Greek journalist in Alexandria at the time, wrote a bitter response. Writing in Tachydromos, which was produced in Alexandria and considered the most prestigious Greek newspaper in Egypt, he noted that "...Averoff's tomb has yet to be sealed and yesterday's Reforme considered it appropriate to take the opportunity to indicate to
us his successor in the presidency of the community". [my translation] (Tachydromos, 1899: 1) He then went on to state that the new President had to be elected soon as the community could not remain without a President for very long during such difficult times. Nevertheless, he considered it inappropriate for elections to take place so soon after the funeral, "...and also inappropriate for 'foreigners to involve themselves in matters which only concern the community". [my translation] (Tachydromos, 1899: 1) Embarrassed by the whole affair, Salvagos left for Europe leaving his associates to pursue the campaign.

The election date was finally set for the 5th of March, 1900. On that day, the Greek Consul-General, Ioannis Gripparis, who was pro-British given the alliance between British capital and the Greek bourgeoisie in Greece, and other officials from the Greek Consulate personally distributed Salvagos' ballot to the community. (Tsirkas, 1973: 398) This was a clear and direct interference by the Greek state and through it British interests in the affairs of the community. Despite the Greek Consulate's efforts Salvagos came in ninth among the elected twelve members of the executive council. The first place was taken by supporters of the anti-British faction, Konstantinidis and Laghonikos. (Tachydromos, 1900: 1) Clearly, the pro-British financiers had yet to win the wholehearted support of the community. It was now up to the twelve members of the executive council to elect the President of the Community, and the date for their meeting was set for the 11th of March, 1900.

Unfortunately, the Greek sources in Alexandria do not include details of what happened during the next few days. This is particularly problematic because in the same issue of Tachydromos, on the 6th of March, 1900, in which were published the election results, Liatsis wrote
that ". . . the councillors of the community will not have any problems in electing the new President. It has been indicated that the distinguished Greek Mister Konstantinos Salvagos is appropriate for this office". [my translation] (Tachydromos, 1900: 1) Nevertheless, despite the efforts of Salvagos, who had been able to convince Liatsis, the meeting of the executive council did not produce a President. At least four of the members of the council who had received more votes than Salvagos were anti-British, and this produced a stalemate. Another meeting was arranged for the 14th of March, 1900, and on that day Salvagos was elected President, and Benakis and Sinadinos were elected Vice-Presidents. (Tsirkas, 1973: 399) The pro-British Greek financiers had finally achieved their ambition to control the community. What had actually taken place which convinced the anti-British councillors to vote for Salvagos is not known.

The very next day, the 15th of March, 1900, the anti-British Greek newspaper of Alexandria, Tilegrafos, which had kept silent throughout the election campaign, published an article informing its readers ". . . that after his election as President, Mister Salvagos gave a speech to his colleagues on the executive council and also established a special committee to collect financial contributions for the victims of the war in the Transvaal". [my translation] (Tilegrafos, 1900: 1) It was not, of course, for the widows and orphans of the Boers. As the official record of the community indicates, the donations were ". . . for the widows and orphans of the English soldiers who were killed in the Transvaal, so as to indicate to the Great English Nation the sincere regards and great gratitude of the Greeks". [my translation] (Radopoulos, 1928: 65)
It is possible that this gesture by Salvagos, being as it was his first activity as President, was a means of confirming his pro-British loyalties and also as a way of apologising to Lord Cromer, on behalf of the entire community, for the events of November, 1899. On the 2nd of November, 1899, Tachydromos published an article in which it noted that "...the defeat of the British in Natal was met with celebrations by the Greek and indigenous population of Alexandria". [my translation] (Tachydromos, 1899: 2) Other historical accounts of the Greek community in Alexandria also note that the Greeks celebrated the British defeat and even held meetings in order to arrange for the sending of financial contributions and volunteers to assist the Boers who were seen to be defending their (sic) paternal land. (Tsirkas, 1973: 400)

Salvagos did not remain President for long. On the 12th of August, 1901, he died of a heart attack in a hotel in Oostende, Belgium, where he was vacationing. The next day Tachydromos published an article in which it was noted that his estate was conservatively estimated to be worth one and a half million sterling. The article went on to inform its readers that

...his estate was divided between his wife and two children, one thousand pounds to the community, and small amounts to his nephew and the children of doctor Vlassopoulos. [my translation] (Tachydromos, 1901: 3)

In contrast to contributions made by the founders of the Greek koinotita the one thousand pounds was so insignificant that it has not even been recorded in the community archives. In November, 1901, Benakis, who had been the first Vice-President, was automatically elected President. The pro-British financiers had now firmly gained control over the Greek community of Alexandria. They continued to control it well into the 1930s, but as the Conclusion to this study will show, with constant
opposition from those members of the Greek community who remained anti-British. Nevertheless, it should also be emphasised that the victory of the financiers permitted the Greek koinotita in Alexandria to adapt to the new socio-economic and political realities that prevailed in Egypt during the twentieth century. The British were now the dominant economic and political power, and as had been the case in the relationship between Michalis Tossitsas and Muhammad 'Ali, the economic and political association between the Greek financiers and the new status quo permitted the Greek community in Alexandria to continue to expand and develop, albeit within a different ideological orientation.
IV. A Bourgeois Confederation of Greek Communities in Egypt.

The previous two sections of this chapter delineated the particular characteristics of the foundation and development of the Greek *koinotita* in Alexandria. From this discussion, it may be suggested that during the nineteenth century the Greek community in Alexandria exemplified the characteristics of a bourgeois democratic socio-economic and political structure and the aspirations of mercantile capital. The very nature of such an economic and ideological orientation motivated the community and its members towards expansion and the generalisation of their structures. The Greek community in Alexandria, however, was founded and developed within the confines of a predominantly agrarian and underdeveloped Egyptian social formation whose historical position was characterised its dependent status in the international division of labour. Thus, from its foundation, the ideological and mercantile tendencies of the Greek community were severely circumscribed, and by the end of the nineteenth century the Greek merchants in Alexandria were successfully replaced by a different fraction of the Greek property owning classes.

The Greek *koinotita* in Alexandria, however, survived a number of crisis during its nineteenth century history and was also able to overcome the ultimate defeat of the mercantile elite who founded it and contributed to its development. Admittedly, the *koinotita*, in order to continue to develop, had to adopt the ideological orientations of its new masters, the Greek financial oligarchy in Alexandria. Furthermore, given the close association between this financial oligarchy and the prevailing socio-economic and political forces in Greece, especially after the Revolution of Ghoudi in 1897, the Greek *koinotita* in Alexandria had to accept the economic and political authority of the Greek state over its
internal affairs. Thus, the Greek community in Alexandria managed to accomplish only one of its two primary objectives during its modern history. It established the separation between civil society and the church, and thus confirmed its autonomy from the Ottoman Empire, but failed to formalise its autonomy from the Greek state.

The separation of civil society from the church was in itself a major accomplishment. The same did not occur formally in Greece until 1987, under the Premierships of Andreas Papandreou. Of greater significance, however, was the implication of this accomplishment for the modern history of the Greeks in Egypt. As it was indicated above, at the start of the nineteenth century all the Greeks in Egypt came under the jurisdiction of the Ottoman millet system and were in effect governed by the Ottoman Sultan via the mediation of the two Greek Orthodox Patriarchs of Istanbul and Alexandria. Thus, the success of the Alexandria koinotita in establishing and formalising its independence from the Alexandria Patriarchate encouraged Greeks in other Egyptian cities, towns and villages to follow the same path. This led to the establishment of a number of Greek communities throughout Egypt which reproduced the socio-economic, cultural and political orientation exemplified by the Alexandria Greek koinotita.

In some respects, therefore, it is possible to suggest that the successful establishment of the Greek community in Alexandria led to the creation and development of a network of relatively autonomous Greek bourgeois entities throughout an agrarian and dependent Egyptian society. In other words, the socio-economic and ideological structures that characterised the Greek community in Alexandria were generalised and thus allowed Alexandria-based Greek merchant capital also to extend its sphere of activity throughout Egypt. It is of some interest to
conclude this chapter with a brief examination of the establishment of this confederation of Greek bourgeois entities in Egypt.

The largest of all the Greek communities to be established in Egypt, after that of Alexandria, was the koinotita of Cairo, even though it was formally established as late as 1904. That should not suggest, however, that there were no Greeks or a Greek demogerontia or paroikia in that city prior to 1904. On the contrary, and as it has already been shown above, there were large numbers of Greeks in Cairo well before they started to settle in Alexandria. Furthermore, the Cairo community archives indicate that the Greeks in that city had attempted on two occasions to establish themselves formally into a koinotita, on the 29th of February, 1856, and on the 22nd of February, 1860. On both occasions they failed and it was not until the 19th of July, 1904, that a Greek Royal Decree was issued that formally recognised them as a legitimate koinotita. (Cairo Community Archives; Politis, 1929: 317-25) There were several factors which prevented the Greeks in Cairo from establishing a koinotita prior to 1904. Of these, two are particularly important and deserve some elaboration.

The first is related to the fact that during the Ottoman occupation of Egypt and up to the early part of the twentieth century, the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria was based in Cairo. During the centuries prior to the nineteenth, the city of Alexandria had declined into an insignificant fishing village on the Mediterranean coast. Furthermore, practically all the Greeks who came to Egypt prior to the nineteenth century settled in Cairo, and the seat of power was also located in that city. It was the Patriarchate, therefore, which had established and administered all the educational, health and social institutions available for the Greeks in Cairo. In Alexandria, however,
these institutions had either been established by the Greeks in that city or with the assistance of the Greek Consulate after 1833. Thus, when the Alexandria Greeks decided to take on Greek citizenship in 1833, and subsequently place their institutions under the political protection of the Greek Consulate, it was a relatively easy matter since they had the support of Muhammad 'Ali. In Cairo, the Patriarchate owned all the institutions and the Patriarch was an Ottoman subject.

The second factor is related to the particular characteristics of those Greeks who had settled in Cairo during the centuries prior to the nineteenth and during the nineteenth century. It has already been indicated above in this chapter and in chapter three that the Greeks who settled in Cairo were predominantly petty-craftsmen, petty-traders engaged in internal trade or mercenaries. Egypt's economic prosperity, however, relied almost exclusively on cotton cultivation and cotton exports to Europe. This activity took place primarily in the Delta, north of Cairo, and in the city of Alexandria. The Greeks in Cairo, therefore, had been unable to take advantage of this prosperity and thus were also unable to establish their own institutions. The case of George Averoff, discussed in chapter two, is a pertinent example of this situation. It was only when Nestor Gianaclis, who had accumulated wealth in Suez, moved to Cairo that some other prosperous Greeks also followed and together they were able to establish their own institutions. Gianaclis contributed to the establishment of the koinotita in Cairo and became its first President. (Politis, 1929: 320)

It should also be pointed out that Gianaclis moved to Cairo rather than Alexandria in order to initiate and develop the first tobacco and wine industries. This is because it was not possible to initiate any form of industrialisation in Alexandria given the prevailing financial character
of the economy of that city at the end of the nineteenth century. In some respects, therefore, the establishment of the Greek koinotita in Cairo by men like Gianaclis also determined the future development of that community. Throughout the twentieth century the Greeks in Cairo were predominantly employed in the professions, technical fields related to industrialisation and as bureaucrats in the Egyptian government. Thus, although the Greek community in Cairo grew in numbers, its members were never able to achieve wealth and prosperity to a degree that could permit them to challenge the status of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria. It was only after Nasir's revolution in 1952, when many private and especially foreign enterprises were nationalised, that Alexandria declined rapidly and the Greek koinotita of Cairo achieved the status of the most prominent Greek community in Egypt.

It is clear from the above that the geographical location of each Greek community was a central factor in determining both its prosperity and its status in the confederation of Greek bourgeois entities in Egypt. Thus, it is not surprising that the Greek community of Mansura is considered by most historians of the modern history of the Greeks in Egypt as the second most important community after that of Alexandria. (Politis, 1929: 326) Mansura is located in the middle of the northern Delta and during the nineteenth century it was the leading centre for cotton ginning, pressing and generally the marketing of cotton. It was near Mansura, in the village of Talha, that the Rallis brothers first settled when they came from Asia Minor in the 1850s, and it was there that Theodoros Rallis made his contribution to the Egyptian cotton trade by importing cotton gins and presses, and also accumulated his first wealth. After Theodoros Rallis moved to Alexandria, his brother Antonis Rallis moved to Mansura and contributed to the establishment of the
first Greek paroikia in that city. On the 8th of May, 1893, the paroikia was transformed into a koinotita, formally recognised by a Greek Royal Decree, and Antonis Rallis was elected as its first President. Antonis Rallis was succeeded by his son Alexander who moved to Alexandria in 1901, when cotton was no longer the primary source of wealth in the Egyptian economy. (Mansura Community Archives; Politis, 1929: 326-9)

The two Greek communities of Port Said and Suez follow that of Mansura in terms of importance and significance during the nineteenth century. By the mid-1860s, there were already many Greeks who had settled in Port Said due to the construction of the Suez Canal. There were five thousand Greek workers from the Greek island of Kassos employed in the Canal project. Their central role in the project is emphasised by the fact that the total number of foreigners involved in the construction of the Canal only numbered seven thousand. Furthermore, Ferdinand de Lesseps, the French initiator and architect of the Suez Canal, expressed his gratitude to the Greek government for their role via a letter to the Greek Consul-General in Alexandria, Zygomalas, dated the 5th of July, 1866. In the same letter de Lesseps also informed the Greek Consul-General that the Suez Canal Company was donating to the Greek government a piece of land with three buildings on it, on Arsenal road, for use by the Greeks in Port Said. (quoted in Politis, 1929: 331-2)

It is important to note the historical significance associated with the donation of this property to the Greek state. First, it highlights the fact that de Lesseps recognised the Greeks from Kassos as Greek citizens, although Kassos was still part of the Ottoman Empire. Second, it also confirms that although numerous, the Greeks in Port Said had been unable to establish their own institutions. At that point in
history, therefore, Port Said had a Greek paroikia. The inauguration of
the Suez Canal in 1867 attracted many merchants who came to take
advantage of the transit trade that developed quickly in that city. By
1889, these Greek merchants had achieved significant wealth and
prosperity and were able to ensure that their community was recognised
by a Greek Royal Decree on the 23rd of December, 1889. In the same
decree, the property that had been donated by de Lesseps was also
formally transferred to the new Greek koinotita in Port Said. (Port Said
Community Archives; Politis, 1929: 333)

Greek merchants had settled in Suez since the early period of Muhammad
'Ali's era. Suez, which is located at the southern end of the Suez
Canal, was a prosperous city which controlled transit trade from Britain
to India from the time when Muhammad 'Ali constructed the Cairo-Suez
railway. Nevertheless, it was not until after the inauguration of the
Suez Canal that these merchants were able to increase their commercial
turnover rapidly and achieve a certain degree of prosperity.
Furthermore, after the British military occupation of Egypt, a large
British military complex was established in Suez and remained there
until 1956. The Greek merchants benefited from the presence of this
military establishment and by 1888 were sufficiently prosperous to
establish their own koinotita. (Suez Community Archives; Politis, 1929:
339)

The two Greek communities of Tanta and Zagaziq follow those of Port Said
and Suez in terms of importance during the nineteenth century. Tanta
and Zagaziq are located in the Delta and in both cases Greeks had
settled there since the 1840s, engaging in the process of extending the
cultivation of cotton and its marketing. (Politis, 1929: 343 and 348)

It was only after the cotton boom period of 1861 to 1867 that both
communities achieved significant wealth and prosperity to enable them to establish their own institutions. Zagaziq became a formally recognised koinotita on the 26th of April, 1870, and Tanta achieved the same formal status in 1880. (Tanta and Zagaziq Community Archives; Politis, 1929: 345 and 350) One of the main factors which enabled Zagaziq to precede Tanta is that the Greeks in the former were also actively involved in the establishment of cotton gins. By 1864, there were already four cotton gins in Zagaziq and they were all owned by Greeks. (Politis, 1929: 348)

In addition to these Greek communities which could be said to have achieved a certain degree of prominence during the nineteenth century, there were also many other smaller and less significant communities which were established during this period. In lower Egypt, for example, where cotton cultivation and marketing was primarily focussed, there were another twelve Greek communities that achieved different degrees of historical significance. As to upper Egypt, which has always been economically the underdeveloped part of Egypt, there were only five Greek communities established during this period. It is of some interest to describe certain of the characteristics of these seventeen communities in the order of their geographical location from north to south.

The Greek community of Ibrahimiyya, an eastern suburb of Alexandria, consisted primarily of petty-merchants, craftsmen, intellectuals and workers. For some time these Greeks had felt that the Greek koinotita of Alexandria did not represent their interests or reflect their socio-political ideology. Nevertheless, for reasons that have already been discussed above, they remained within the community. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, however, and with the spread of socialist
ideology by Italian emigres in Alexandria, these Greeks started to establish a number of radical socio-political associations. When the Greek financial oligarchy was able to consolidate its control over the affairs of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria in 1900-1, the associations felt that they could no longer continue to exist within it. Thus, on the 15th of March, 1903, the associations joined up and formed an independent community in Ibrahimiyya, which had become a lower class residential area. This community, with its own school and church, was called an Adelfotis (Fraternity) and its statutes differed from those of all the other Greek communities in Egypt. (Kipiadis, 1903: 14-6)

Its history, however, was very brief. Due to their limited financial resource they were unable to sustain their institutions and on the 22nd of May, 1904, they were forced to declare bankruptcy. On that same day, the executive council of the Adelfotis abolished its statutes and adopted those of the Greek koinotita of Alexandria. (Xenos, 1957: 24)

Nevertheless, the Greek koinotita of Ibrahimiyya, as it was now called, continued to exist throughout the twentieth century due to considerable financial subsidies from the wealthy Greek financiers in Alexandria. From discussions with members of this community, it appears that there was an understanding between the koinotita of Alexandria and the koinotita of Ibrahimiyya that the former would assist in financial matters if the members of the latter refrained from participating in the elections held by the former. This is despite the fact that the Greeks in Ibrahimiyya were entitled to vote in the Alexandria koinotita, whose statutes gave the right to vote to all Greeks residing in the city. Thus, the Ibrahimiyya community, from which emerged the first Greek Trade Unions in Egypt and the nucleus of the first Greek Communist Party in the early part of the twentieth century, allowed the Alexandria
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koinotita to sustain its oligarchic character while at the same time its statutes exemplified the principle of universal suffrage. 

The Greek community of Damanhur, capital of the northern Delta province of Bahaira, was established by a Greek Royal Decree on the 3rd of January, 1905. The Greek community, however, had existed in this rural town since the 1880s, and were engaged primarily in the early establishment of a textile industry in Egypt. It is with the development of this sector of the Egyptian economy in the 1930s, after the removal of British control over the Egyptian economy in the late 1920s, that the community also prospered. (Damanhur Community Archives)

In the vicinity of Tanta there were four Greek communities in the provincial towns of Kafr al-Zayyat, Zifta, Shabin al-Qum and Mahalla al-Kubra. The community of Kafr al-Zayyat, which was established as early as 1872, achieved its prominence in the 1930s. The Greeks in this provincial town, which had a number of cotton gins, embarked on the processing of cotton seeds and the manufacture of soap and edible oil. Thus, as was the case with the Greeks in Damanhur, during the 1930s they were able to prosper and achieve an important place in the history of Egyptian industrialisation. (Kafr al-Zayyat Community Archives; Diakofotaki, 1973) Their role and significance in the history of Egyptian industrialisation is confirmed by the fact that the Zerbinis soap and oil industrial enterprises in Kafr al-Zayyat received special consideration from Nasir's Revolutionary Command Council in 1952, and the Zerbinis family was able to maintain private control over the enterprises until 1956 when they were sold to the Egyptian state. (Zerbinis, 1956)

The Greek communities of Zifta and Shabin al-Qum were established on the 1st of January, 1881 and in 1910, respectively. The Greeks in both
these provincial towns engaged in local trade and agricultural production, but were never able to achieve any significance or prominence in the modern history of the Greeks in Egypt. (Zifta and Shabin al-Qum Community Archives) This was not the case of the community in Mahalla al-Kubra, which was established in 1880, by the joint efforts of the sixty Greek families who had been there since the late 1850s. All these Greeks were involved in the textile industry as Mahalla al-Kubra was and still is Egypt's leading textile centre. (Mahalla al-Kubra Community Archives) Nevertheless, the Greeks in this provincial town were unable to dominate the textile sector because it was in Mahalla al-Kubra that the first Egyptian industrialists emerged in the 1930s. The Bank Misr group, as it became known, used the textile industries of Mahalla al-Kubra as a basis for the development of its many industrial enterprises throughout the country. Furthermore, the Bank Misr group was made up of fervent Egyptian nationalists who had actively participated in the 1919 Revolution, and were not interested in collaborating with the Greeks in the town. Instead, the Bank Misr group bought out all the Greeks and established a purely Egyptian textile industry in Mahalla al-Kubra from the mid-1920s. (Deeb, 1976; Tignor, 1976)

In the vicinity of Zagazig there were three Greek communities in the provincial towns of Banha, Minat al-Qamh and Faqus. These communities were established on the 23rd of November, 1903, the 10th of February, 1912, and the 28th of February, 1907, respectively. They never achieved much prosperity or prominence as all the Greeks in these towns were either petty-merchants or agents for large Greek commercial enterprises in Alexandria. When any of those Greeks accumulated some wealth they would tend to move to Alexandria. (Banha, Minat al-Qamh and Faqus
It was in the environs of Cairo that the last three Greek communities in Lower Egypt were located. They were established in Zaitun, Helwan and Heliopolis which are all presently suburbs of Cairo. The history of the Greek communities in Zaitun and Helwan were very similar to the history of the Greek community of Ibrahimiyya. They consisted primarily of workers, craftsmen and petty-merchants and were almost completely financially supported by wealthy Greeks from Cairo. As to the community of Heliopolis, it was established by Greek Royal Decree on the 13th of February, 1926, and it consisted primarily of middle class professionals who worked in a number of European banks and other economic enterprises in Cairo. (Zaitun, Helwan and Heliopolis Community Archives)

Of the five Greek communities located in Upper Egypt, that of Miniya was by far the most important. It was established by Greek Royal Decree on the 4th of March, 1893, although the community records date back to 1862 when their first church was constructed. The communities of Bani Suwaif and Assiut were established on the 17th of February, 1889, and the 20th of March, 1893, respectively. All three communities consisted primarily of petty-merchants who took advantage of the fact that these three provincial towns were located on the main over-land trade route from Alexandria to the Sudan and on to Africa. With the British military occupation of Egypt and their concern to link this country with other British protectorates in Africa, transit trade developed rapidly in these towns and they attracted a number of Greek merchants. An interesting characteristic of these communities is that when particular merchants accumulated some wealth, they did not move to Cairo or Alexandria, but headed south for the Sudan and beyond. It is Greek merchants from these towns that established the Greek communities in the
Sudan, Ethiopia, and even South Africa during the first quarter of the twentieth century. (Miniya, Bani Suwaif, and Assiyut Community Archives)

The Greek community of Fayyum, a large fertile oasis about eighty miles south-west of Cairo, was the only community in Upper and Lower Egypt whose members were engaged almost exclusively in agricultural production. The community was established on the 25th of January, 1899, and consisted entirely of Greeks who worked as agronomists, supervisors, and in other such occupations on the lands owned by the Egyptian Royal family. Finally, the Greek community in Aswan is the only community whose members were Ottoman citizens until 1914, and subsequently Egyptian citizens, but which was actually recognised by Greek Royal Decree on the 5th of December, 1908. It consisted almost entirely of Greeks who had participated in the construction of the first Aswan Dam which was completed in 1902. (Richards, 1982: 69) It was by far the poorest Greek community in Egypt and the only one which had never been able to construct its own school. Thus, the Greeks in Aswan attended Egyptian schools and by the middle of the twentieth century they were completely Egyptianised and only a few older men spoke a few words of Greek. It is also the only community for which there are no archival records.

The preceding discussion has highlighted some of the characteristics of the Greek communities throughout Egypt. With the community of Alexandria, and excluding the community of Aswan, they constituted an informal confederation of twenty-four Greek bourgeois entities in Egypt. An important aspect of this confederation is that due to the diverse nature of these communities it allowed the Greeks in Egypt to participate in practically most of the important aspects of modern Egyptian economic history. Furthermore, the geographical distribution
of these communities also meant that by the end of the nineteenth century there was some form of institutionalised Greek presence throughout Egypt. This, of course, was a significant characteristic when it is noted that most other non-Egyptians had established communities in only a few of the prominent urban centres, such as Alexandria, Cairo, Port Said and Suez. Finally, the fact that all these Greek communities reproduced, in principle at least, the bourgeois democratic statutes and regulations adopted by the Greek koinotita of Alexandria suggests that the Greeks in Egypt contributed indirectly to socio-political and ideological transformations within Egyptian society. It was a transformation which was to lead to a number of important socio-cultural and political developments during the twentieth century.
1. For a critique of this Orientalist perception see Roger Owen, "The Middle East in the Eighteenth Century - an 'Islamic' Society in Decline: a critique of Gibb and Bowen's Islamic Society and the West", in Review of Middle East Studies, Vol. 1, 1975: 101-12.

2. The reason for using this inadequate and ideological Orientalist account of Middle Eastern society in this chapter is that the discussion of the formation and development of the Greek community in Alexandria in the rest of the chapter also focuses on the ideological dimensions of this process.

3. There are a number of documents in the archives of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria which confirm both the significance of the dues paid by the Greek ships docking in Alexandria for the running expenses of the Greek hospital in that city and the manner in which the Greek state and the Greek Consul-General used these funds as a leverage in exercising their authority over the Greek community. See, for example: 1. Letter from the Greek Secretary of Foreign Affairs, A Mavrocordatos, dated 15 May, 1834, and addressed to Michalis Tossitsas, requesting details of the dues paid by Greek ships and their use for the Greek hospital; 2. Letter by the Greek Minister, J Rizos, dated the 4th of November, 1834, addressed to Michalis Tossitsas which authorised him to collect such dues for the benefit of the hospital, at the rate of "...15 Turkish piasters or 4 Greek drachmas and 80 lepta [1 drachma = 100 lepta] from large vessels and 7½ piasters or 2 drachmas and 20 lepta from small vessels...in order to bring about all the improvements necessary to this establishment [hospital] for the benefit of suffering humanity." (Politis, 1929: 260); and 3. Correspondence between the Greek Community in Alexandria and the Greek Consul-General in that city in 1856 which discussed whether such dues should still be collected for the benefit of the hospital.

4. An anonymous Greek from Alexandria has recorded in great detail the prolonged negotiations between the Greek Community and the Greek Patriarchate of Alexandria in a book that was published in 1862. (Anon, 1862) It is clear from his account that in addition to the question of authority, the Patriarchate was primarily concerned to ensure that it participated in the increasing wealth and prosperity being accumulated by the Greeks in Alexandria. Thus, the anonymous Greek recorded the lengthy negotiations between the two parties regarding the potential financial benefits for the Patriarchate if the Patriarch agreed to recognise the autonomy of the community over its religious institutions. (Anon, 1862: 7-14)

5. A talaris was the Egyptian word for an Austrian thaler.

6. The total cost of constructing the church reached 17,000 Egyptian pounds while the community was able to raise only 9,016 Egyptian pounds from donations. The difference was raised by various loans. (Radopoulos, 1928: 19-21)

7. It is interesting to note that Professor Edmund Keeley, the major Western authority on Cavafy does not include these poems in his
classic study, Cavafy's Alexandria: Study of a Myth in Progress. (Keeley, 1977) In contrast Stratis Tsirkas (1973) considers them among the most important written by the Alexandrine poet.

8. The two major working class unions behind the establishment of the Fraternity were: The Alexandria Worker's Association, established in 1881, and the The Greek Union of Cigarette Workers, established in 1896. The founding statutes of both are available, but it is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss them. For a discussion of the Greek working class in Alexandria and in Egypt in general a separate study is needed.
CONCLUSION

The substantive concern of this study has revolved around the role and activities of certain Greek entrepreneurs in relation to the historical development of the Greek community in Alexandria during the nineteenth century. The Greek entrepreneurs and the Alexandria community, however, continued to exist and in some respects flourish well into the twentieth century. In fact, it was not until the dramatic transformations experienced by Egyptian society in the early 1960s, that the Greek Community and the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria suffered a rapid and ultimate decline in status and numbers. It is important, therefore, to conclude this study with a brief and schematic account of the primary characteristics of the Greek community in Alexandria at the turn of the century and immediately thereafter. The importance of such an account derives from the fact that it allows the specificity of the nineteenth century history of the Greek community in Alexandria to be highlighted in reference to developments during the twentieth century.

There are two important indicators that characterise the Greek community in Alexandria at the turn of the century. First, at an economic level, it is the establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce in 1901; and second, at a socio-cultural and political level, it is the prolific poetic production of Konstantinos Cavafy. Each of these indicators will be briefly discussed below.
Chapter five of this study indicated that the Greeks in Alexandria organised themselves into a formal community from as early as 1843. By 1854, the Greek koinotita in Alexandria was recognised by the Egyptian and Greek states as an independent corporate body with its own internal statutes and regulations, and a few years later their autonomy was also recognised by the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Alexandria. Furthermore, chapter five also indicated that the particular form of organisation adopted by the Greek koinotita distinguished the Greeks in Alexandria from other European settlers in Egypt. In general, most European settlers in Egypt relied upon their respective consulates to organise and administer their social, religious and cultural affairs. This study - in chapters one and four - also emphasised the pioneering and dominant role in several sectors of the Egyptian economy that was played by the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria. It is surprising, therefore, that throughout the nineteenth century, the Greeks in Alexandria made no attempt to establish a corporate economic organisation that would both represent and enhance their interests. Nevertheless, both the absence and presence of such an economic form of organisation during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries respectively highlights important developments and transformations in the modern history of the Greek community in Alexandria. Let me elaborate.

In some respects it is possible to suggest that both the 'individualistic' and 'pioneering' attitudes of many of the Greek settlers in Alexandria during the nineteenth century inhibited the establishment of an economic corporate form of organisation. In fact, it can even be argued that it was this attitude of these early settlers which motivated them to formalise their autonomy from both the Greek
Orthodox Patriarchate in Alexandria and the Greek state. The establishment of the Greek koinotita, however, exemplified both communal and collective forms of socio-political and cultural organisation and thus highlight the fact that the 'individualism' and 'pioneering spirit' of the nineteenth century Greek settlers in Alexandria are inadequate explanations for the absence of an equivalent economic collective form of organisation. There is, however, an economic explanation for the absence of a Greek economic and corporate form of organisation in Alexandria during the nineteenth century.

Chapter four of this study emphasised the fact that the most prominent economic activities of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria focussed in the spheres of commerce and finance. In fact, this chapter indicated that up until the 1870s the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria virtually monopolised many branches of the commercial and financial sectors of the Egyptian economy. Subsequent to the British military occupation of Egypt in 1882, the prominence of the Greek entrepreneurs in the Egyptian economy experienced a significant and rapid decline. This, however, was not due to the decline of the commercial and financial sectors of the Egyptian economy. On the contrary, as chapter three indicated, both these sectors, and especially finance and banking, experienced considerable growth subsequent to 1882. Instead, as mentioned in chapter four, the rapid decline of Greek economic prominence during the last two decades of the nineteenth century derived in part from the discriminatory economic policies of Lord Cromer - de facto ruler of Egypt as of 1882 - which favoured European and especially British capital. In such circumstances, therefore, it would not be surprising if the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria decided to organise themselves into an economic corporate body in order to defend their interests.
Nevertheless, as this account will endeavour to show below, the Greek Chamber of Commerce was not established solely for the purpose of representing and enhancing the interests of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria. On the contrary, it eventually became clear that the Greek Chamber of Commerce was primarily concerned to control the economic activities of the Greeks in Alexandria - integrate them into the economic policies of Lord Cromer - and to bolster the newly acquired economic and social status of one section of the Greek entrepreneurs in that city, namely the financial oligarchy. Of course, the generally felt need among the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria for an economic corporate organisation that would protect and enhance their economic interests provided the necessary legitimation for the establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce.

Two important historical events at the end of the nineteenth century, however, need to be mentioned at this point. First, as chapter five indicated, subsequent to the Revolution of Ghoudi in Greece in 1897, the interests of the newly established Greek bourgeoisie "converged" clearly and directly with British policy in the eastern Mediterranean - Greece and Egypt included. This was due to the fact, that having removed the pro-German Greek monarchy the Greek bourgeoisie was compelled to rely entirely on British support in order to consolidate its vulnerable economic and political status in the country. Second, as it was also indicated in chapter five, the change of the status quo in Greece had an immediate effect in the political affairs of the Greek community in Alexandria. Subsequent to the death of Averoff in July, 1899, and after a bitterly fought election campaign in which the Greek Consul-General played an active role, Salvagos emerged as the new President of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria in March, 1900. Given that Averoff and
Salvagos represented different sections of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria this election exemplified the transition of power from the commercial bourgeoisie to the pro-British financial oligarchy. It is possible to suggest, therefore, that the combination of these two events seriously undermined the political autonomy of the Greek koinotita with respect to both the Greek and Egyptian states - both of which in effect represented British interests at the time. Within such a new political configuration the Greek commercial bourgeoisie in Alexandria was placed at a major disadvantage in its attempts to safeguard its declining economic status.

Nevertheless, the establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce constituted an important landmark in the modern history of the Greek community in Alexandria. Not only was it the second such institution to be established in any of the Greek communities in the diaspora - the first having been established in Istanbul in 1890 - but there were still no similar organisations in the independent Greek state. The first Chamber of Commerce to be established in Greece was that of Pireus in 1914, subsequent to the passing of special legislation - law number 184 - which enabled such an organisation to be formed legally. It should also be noted that although the British, French and Italian communities in Egypt had already established their respective Chambers of Commerce during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the first Egyptian Chamber of Commerce was not established until 1922.

(Greek Chamber of Commerce, 1951: 10)

It is possible, therefore, to draw two preliminary conclusions with regard to the establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce. On the one hand, and especially in respect of the development of corporate economic institutions in modern Egypt and Greece, the Greek Chamber of
Commerce in Alexandria constituted a pioneering event. An event, it might be added, which was in keeping with the overall pioneering role and activities of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria during the nineteenth century. On the other hand, the relatively late establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce in Alexandria reflected for the first time that the Greek entrepreneurs were forced to follow in the pioneering footsteps of the other European business communities in that city. In order to elaborate, however, on the various issues that have been mentioned above, it is necessary to examine in greater detail the establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce and some of its specific characteristics.

In many respects the Greek Chamber of Commerce was established as a direct result of the activities of the secretary of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria, Antonis Saktouris, and the wholehearted support of the Greek Consul-General, Nicolas Ghenadis. It was the latter who invited eighteen prominent Greek entrepreneurs from Alexandria to the Consulate premises on the 20th of January, 1901, in order to draft the founding statutes of the Greek Chamber of Commerce. The eighteen entrepreneurs invited were the following:


(Greek Chamber of Commerce, 1951: 11)

By the end of the meeting the founding statutes had been drafted and formally adopted by all those present, and these statutes remained in force until 1952. The meeting then proceeded to elect the first executive committee which included: E Benakis as President, I Laghonicos and S Papathanasopoulos as first and second Vice-Presidents.
respectively, D Tamvacopoulos as Secretary and G Zervoudachis as Treasurer. (Greek Chamber of Commerce, 1951: 11) The election of Benakis and Zervoudachis, as President and Treasurer respectively, underscored the newly acquired status and economic wealth of the pro-British Greek financial oligarchy in Alexandria who were primarily represented by Benakis, Salvagos, Sinadinós and Zervoudachis. Furthermore, the fact that the meeting took place in the Greek Consulate rather than in any of the numerous buildings owned by the Greek koinotita in Alexandria also emphasised the growing influence of the Greek state - and thus also the influence of Britain - in the affairs of the community. This is clearly indicated in the statutes of the Greek Chamber of Commerce which are reproduced in Appendix Three.

The growing influence of the Greek state is evident from the very first article of the founding constitution which notes that the aim of the Greek Chamber of Commerce is to encourage and develop the commercial relations between Egypt and Greece. No mention is made in the first articles of the necessity to safeguard the interests of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria, which contrasts clearly with the founding constitution of the Greek koinotita in Alexandria that was adopted nearly half a century earlier. This contrast is revealed even further when it is noted that article eighteen of the constitution named the Greek Consul-General in Alexandria or his appointed representative as the Honorary President of the Greek Chamber of Commerce. Thus, in distinct contrast to the efforts by the Greek koinotita to remove the influence of the Greek state from their affairs, which was discussed in chapter five, the Greek Chamber of Commerce readily re-introduced it.

This increasing influence of the Greek state was also reflected in article twenty-seven, which placed the Greek Chamber of Commerce under
the authority of the Greek Consulate in Alexandria and stipulated that
the former had to conduct all its transactions with Greek and foreign
institutions through the latter. As to the growing influence of
Britain, this was illustrated in two particular paragraphs in article
two of the statutes which indicated the manner in which the Greek
Chamber of Commerce could be used by the British rulers in Egypt to
increase their control over the economic activities of the Greek
entrepreneurs in Alexandria. Paragraph seven allowed the officials of
the Greek Chamber of Commerce to divulge to the general public
information concerning the financial status of its individual members.
The public release of such information, of course, could be detrimental
to the viability of many Greek entrepreneurs who had been suffering
economically in the context of the newly established British economic
and political hegemony in Egypt.

The manner in which the Greek Chamber of Commerce in effect increased
the vulnerability of the ordinary Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria was
further underscored in paragraph ten. This paragraph stipulated that
membership in and nomination by the Greek Chamber of Commerce was a
necessary prerequisite for the election of Alexandrine Greeks to the
various commercial and penal tribunals belonging to the Mixed Courts in
that city. This was a particularly important clause in that it
effectively gave those who controlled the Greek Chamber of Commerce
veto power over which Greek entrepreneurs could be elected to these
tribunals. This is in distinct contrast to the period prior to the
establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce when prominent Greek
entrepreneurs in Alexandria could be elected to these tribunals on the
basis of their economic and social status in the city and without the
need to be nominated from any institution.
The importance of this veto power is underscored by the fact that since the establishment of these tribunals in 1876, they constituted the sole legal structure within which all commercial arbitrations involving non-Egyptians were resolved. Thus, these tribunals also represented an important means by which the orientation of commercial and financial affairs in the city could be controlled. The type of Greek representation in these tribunals, therefore, was of particular concern to the British authorities in Egypt who were attempting to consolidate the hegemony of British capital in that country. The fact, therefore, that the Greek Chamber of Commerce was controlled by the pro-British financial oligarchy in Alexandria and greatly influenced by the pro-British Greek state enabled the British authorities in Egypt to pursue their policies in a framework which at face value, at least, did not reflect any discrimination against the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria. These discriminatory policies were further safeguarded from public debate within the Greek Chamber of Commerce as a result of article three of its constitution which prohibited all discussions other than those which related directly to its primary aims. The significance of such a clause is underscored by the fact that Egypt was de facto under British military control and the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria were one of the victims of the economic policies of the occupying power.

It is possible, therefore, to conclude this brief account of the establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce in Alexandria by suggesting that its ostensible raison d'etre was diametrically opposed to its aims and objectives. Whereas the establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce was initially welcomed by most of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria - in that it could serve the purpose of defending their vulnerable interests - in effect this Greek economic
institution was constructed in such a manner that it ultimately served the interests of the Greek state and the British authorities in Egypt. To elaborate on such a suggestion, of course, it would be necessary to embark on an extensive discussion of the actual activities of the Greek Chamber of Commerce during the twentieth century. This, however, is beyond the scope of this study.

Nevertheless, the actual manner and form adopted by the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria for the establishment of their first Chamber of Commerce confirms that the Greek community in that city had already experienced a significant transformation. At the turn of the century, the community was already under the control of the pro-British Greek financial oligarchy whose role and activities ensured that the future development of the community would conform to the requirements of British capital in Egypt and evolving interests of the pro-British Greek bourgeoisie in Greece. In this respect, the history of the Greek community in Alexandria during the twentieth century contrasts sharply with that of its earlier history, namely during the nineteenth century.
II. Alexandria: The City of Cavafy

Alexandria was the foremost port of Egypt, and a hive of activity for the country's cotton brokers...with wide streets flanked by palms and flame trees, large gardens, stylish villas, neat new buildings, and above all, room to breathe. Life was easy. Labour was cheap. Nothing was impossible, especially when it involved one's comfort. (Pinchin, 1989: 29)

This characterisation of Alexandria during the early part of the twentieth century by Mrs Jacqueline Carol, an Alexandria Armenian married to a British banker, contrasts sharply with several Cavafy poems and especially The City, which was originally written in 1894 but published in 1910. Although the poem had been written in 1894, Cavafy selected it to head the publication in 1917 of the first bound volume of his poetry. (Keeley, 1977: 15) Thus, it is possible to suggest that the poem expressed feelings and emotions which may have exemplified Cavafy's characterisation of Alexandria and his attitude towards the city for almost a quarter of a century. For this reason it is worth reproducing the entire poem

You said: "I'll go to another country, go to another shore, find another city better than this one. Whatever I try to do is fated to turn out wrong and my heart lies buried like something dead. How long can I let my mind moulder in this place? Wherever I turn, wherever I look, I see the black ruins of my life, here, where I've spent so many years, wasted them, destroyed them totally."

You won't find a new country, won't find another shore. This city will always pursue you. You'll walk the same streets, grow old in the same neighbourhoods, turn gray in the same houses. You'll always end up in this city. Don't hope for things elsewhere: there's no ship for you, there's no road. Now that you've wasted your life here, in this small corner, you've destroyed it everywhere in the world. (Keeley, 1977: 15)
Such feelings of despair about Alexandria are expressed by Cavafy in a number of poems that were written during the first two decades of the twentieth century. "Exiles," an un-published poem written in 1914, is quite characteristic. In this poem Cavafy remarks:

> It goes on being Alexandria still. Just walk a bit along the straight road that ends at the Hippodromme and you'll see palaces and monuments that will amaze you.

> Whatever war-damage it's suffered, however much smaller it's become, it's still a wonderful city. (Pinchin, 1989: 68)

Both poems quoted above suggest the ambivalent and contradictory feelings of Cavafy towards Alexandria during the early part of the twentieth century. In "The City" the poet's feelings of despair are quite clear, while in "Exiles" the underlying feelings of strong attachment to Alexandria seem to lead Cavafy towards a more accepting attitude in regard to the city, despite "the war-damage." Of course, it is important to avoid any form of crude reductionism which would suggest that the poetry of Cavafy reflects directly whatever transformations were being experienced by either the city of Alexandria or the Greek community.

Nevertheless, it is interesting to consider the manner in which many of the poems, at least, coincided with particularly important events in the history of the Greek community in Alexandria. For example, in the same year in which the pro-British financial oligarchy accepted the involvement of the Greek state, and thus British interests, in the formation of the Greek Chamber of Commerce, Cavafy published "Che fece...il gran rifiuto" (The One Who Shouts the Great No). This poem, which was published on the 31st of August, 1901, borrowed its title from the third stanza of Dante's "Inferno," which reads: "Che fece per viltate
il gran rifiuto". Cavafy, however, dropped the two words "per viltate" (out of cowardice). The poem goes as follows:

To certain people there comes a day
when they must say the great Yes or the great No.
He who has the Yes ready with him
reveals himself at once, and saying it he crosses over
to the path of honour and his own conviction.
He who refuses does not repent. Should he be asked again,
he would say No again. And yet that No --
the right No -- crushes him for the rest of his life. (Pinchin, 1989: 216)

Most literary interpretations of Cavafy's work suggest that this poem expresses the poet's refusal to adopt a heterosexual life-style, and his own recognition that his homosexuality "crushes him for the rest of his life". (Keeley, 1977 and Pinchin, 1989) Nevertheless, Stratis Tsirkas has made extensive use of Cavafy's personal diaries and concludes that this particular poem expresses the poet's refusal to accept Greek or British control over the affairs of the Greek community in Alexandria. (Tsirkas, 1971: 170 and Tsirkas, 1973: 347-366) In fact, Tsirkas devotes an entire chapter in his study, Ο Καβάφης και η Εποχή του (Cavafy and his Epoch) (1973) to a discussion of the political dimensions of this poem. Based on an extensive discussion of the various drafts of the poem and Cavafy's notes, Tsirkas concludes that the "great No" in this poem clearly reflected the poet's own political stance with regard to the British presence in Egypt.

Tsirkas also points out that the political views held by Cavafy were also reflected in the fact that the poet had renounced his British citizenship in favour of a Greek passport in 1885. (Tsirkas, 1973: 361) Given that Cavafy was employed by the British-controlled Ministry of Irrigation, such an act of defiance was not welcomed by the poet's superiors. In 1894, the general inspector of irrigation, Gail Foster,
remarked that "as he [Cavafy] remains a Greek citizen, he cannot hope to be become a permanent employee." [my translation] (Tsirkas, 1973: 361) Cavafy's contract at the Ministry of Irrigation was renewed on an annual basis, until his retirement in 1922.

It is beyond the scope of this study to attempt to resolve the different interpretations of Cavafy's poetry. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the political interpretation presented by Tsirkas stands in distinct contrast to all the other interpretations, whether by Greek or non-Greek scholars. Tsirkas, of course, a prominent modern Greek literary figure in his own right, was born in Alexandria and was greatly influenced by the work of Cavafy whom he knew quite well. Maybe this is the reason for which Tsirkas' interpretation of another well known Cavafy poem, *Thermopylae* is also in distinct contrast to the interpretations found in other literary accounts of this poem.

*Honour to those who in their lives are committed and guard their Thermopylae.*
*Never stirring from duty; just and upright in all their deeds,*
*but with pity and compassion too; generous whenever they are rich, and when*
*they are poor, again a little generous,*
*again helping as much as they are able; always speaking the truth,*
*but without rancour for those who lie.*

*An they merit great honour when they foresee (and many do foresee) that Ephialtes will finally appear,*
*and in the end the Medes will go through.* (Cavafy, 1961: 9)

This poem was written in 1901, but was published on the 30th of November, 1903. (Tsirkas, 1973: 369) According to Tsirkas, who has devoted another entire chapter to a discussion of this poem, Cavafy recognises the futility of challenging the new status quo in Alexandria - "the Medes [Britain] will go through" - but admires the efforts of many members of the Greek community to safeguard the interest of their
community from the encroachments of the pro-British financial oligarchy and Lord Cromer. (Tsirkas, 1973: 369-73 and 404-23) In distinct contrast, for example, Pinchin sees this poem as reflecting Cavafy's interest in classical Greek history and concludes that "it should be obvious that the classical perfection of fifth-century Greece did not interest him [Cavafy]." (Pinchin, 1989: 41) Similarly, Edmund Keeley, also sees this poem as reflecting Cavafy's interest in the classical period and especially the confirmation of "...a 'historical poet' to see the full spectrum of the historical process." (Keeley, 1977: 34)

The political interpretation of Cavafy's poetry by Stratis Tsirkas is given some form of credibility when situated in the context of a particular event which took place in Alexandria in 1916-17. With the start of the First World War, Greece remained neutral until Venizelos, who represented the pro-British Greek bourgeoisie, carried out a coup d'état at the end of 1916, established a temporary government in Thessaloniki and entered Greece in the war on the side of Britain. The Greek Consulate in Alexandria immediately recognised the Venizelos government, on the 5th of November, 1916, and called upon the Greeks in the city to declare officially and financially their allegiance. In order to do so, the Greeks in Alexandria had to go personally to the Greek Consulate and sign a formal declaration recognising Venizelos as the new Head of State and make their financial contribution to the war effort. The response of the community was not overly enthusiastic. On the 9th of March, 1917, however, Dimitris Theodorakis, a founding member and the then current President of the Greek Chamber of Commerce transmitted to the community an ultimatum that had been issued by the British authorities in Alexandria. Theodorakis noted that "...the English Governor had set a deadline (14 March, 1917) for the signing of
the declarations, after which we do not know what decisions he will take. We must, therefore, hurry and make the declarations...in order to show that those who refuse are but a few." [my translation] (Peridis, 1948: 105)

Many Greeks in Alexandria understood the message of the English Governor and on the last day went to the Greek Consulate and signed the declaration. Among those who signed on that last day was Konstantinos Cavafy. (Peridis, 1948: 105 and Tsirkas, 1973: 471) It may be suggested, therefore, that the British in Egypt used the Greek Chamber of Commerce to apply the necessary pressure on the Greek community in Alexandria to recognise the pro-British government of Venizelos. The "support" of the community was obtained and it did contribute to the consolidation of Venizelos' power. Cavafy, who only signed on the last day, had clearly predicted a few years earlier that "Medes [Britain] will go through". The guardians of Thermopylae were all but dead, and the Greek community of Alexandria had been transformed into an agency which served British interests both in Egypt and in the eastern Mediterranean.

Cavafy, whose family background at least represented the old commercial bourgeoisie, and the other Greeks in Alexandria who did not constitute part of the financial oligarchy, resigned themselves to thinking about old glories and tried to adapt themselves to the changing circumstances. According to Tsirkas, their mood was reflected by Cavafy in a poem, In the Year 200 BC. Alexander, son of Philip, and the Greeks, except the Lacedaemonians which was written in 1916 and published in 1931. It should also be added that this is one poem where other critics of Cavafy's work also note that it is "...a work so subtle in its mode that it demands careful reading to unravel its apparent ambiguities, though
part of its force lies in the residue of ambiguity it permits." (Keeley, 1977: 145) Keeley goes on to argue that this poem "...provides a survey of historical events, and their implications, from Alexander's conquests in Persia to the optimum moment of the decline of Hellenism, and, by suggestion, into the history of Hellenism beyond." (Keeley, 1977: 146) Thus, even Keeley is willing to admit that this poem might reflect in some form Cavafy's 'political' perception of modern Hellenism, and, by suggestion it might be added, the fate of the Greek (Hellenic) community in Alexandria. For this reason, however, it is worth quoting the poem in full.

We can very easily imagine
how utterly indifferent they were in Sparta
to this inscription, "except the Lacedaemonians."
But it was natural. The Spartans were not
of those who would let themselves be led and ordered about
like highly paid servants. Besides,
a panhellenic campaign without
a Spartan king as commander in chief
would not have appeared very important.
O, most assuredly, "except the Lacedaemonians."

That too is a stand. It is understood.

So, except the Lacedaemonians, at Granicus;
and then at Issus; and in the decisive battle
where the formidable army that the Persians
had massed at Arbela for victory and was swept away.

And out of the remarkable panhellenic campaign,
victorious, brilliant in every way,
celebrated far and wide, glorious
as no other had ever been glorified,
the incomparable: we were born;
a vast new Hellenic world, a great new Hellenic world.

We, the Alexandrians, the Antiocheans,
the Seleucians, and the innumerable
rest of the Greeks of Egypt and of Syria,
and of Media, and Persia, and the many others.
With our extensive empire,
with the varied action of our thoughtful adaptations,
and our common Greek, our Spoken Language,
we carried it into the heart of Bactria, to the Indians.

Are we going to talk of Lacedaemonians now! (Cavafy, 1961: 167)
It is important to point out that the date of 200 BC in the poem's title refers to a period of classical history when the Romans entered the Hellenic world and especially the crushing defeat of the last Macedonian king in 197 BC. The narrative in the poem, however, refers to historical events that had taken place about one hundred and thirty years earlier. The contrast between the chronological periods suggests that Cavafy was concerned to emphasise the manner in which this poem should be understood. In other words, an observer living at the time when the classical Hellenic world was being destroyed by the Romans, reflecting on earlier glories and refusing to talk about the Lacedaemonians. According to Tsirkas, the Lacedaemonians represent the Greek financial oligarchy in Alexandria, and the commercial bourgeoisie are represented by Alexander from Macedonia, given that Tossitsas, Averoff and many other early Greek settlers in Alexandria came from northern Greece. Thus, Tsirkas concludes his analysis of this poem by suggesting that the last line indicates that the remnants of the Greek commercial bourgeoisie had resigned themselves to accepting the supremacy of the financial oligarchy and instead concentrated on past glories. (Tsirkas, 1973: 441-5) The only act of resistance was to exclude the financial oligarchy from the conceptualisation of past glories – as the Lacedaemonians had been excluded from the Panhellenic glories of Alexander.

It should be clear from the above brief discussion of a few of Cavafy's poems that the poet's literary production has led to a number of different interpretations. This, of course, is what might be expected given that poetry is not an immediate reflection of reality. On the contrary, poetry expresses views, feelings and emotions, but via several mediating levels such as the socio-political, cultural, literary and
even economic reality within which the poet exists. This is even more so the case with regard to such poets as Cavafy who is recognised by all as being a master of the art. Literary critics, however, depending on their own particular style of literary criticism, may allocate analytical priority to one of the different realities which are invariably reflected in any one poem. Thus, it is not the task of this discussion to arbitrate between the different interpretations of Cavafy's poetry. Nevertheless, it is possible to suggest that the manner in which analytical priority is arrived at may in fact derive partially from the critic's own perception of the wider environment within which the poem was written. Thus, it is possible to argue that Tsirkas', Keeley's and Pinchin's interpretations of Cavafy's poetry derive, in part at least, from the respective different characterisations of the city of Alexandria during the period in which the poet lived and worked. It is of some interest, therefore, to consider briefly the different characterisations of Alexandria that underlay the different interpretations of Cavafy's poetry.

Edmund Keeley and Jane Lagoudis Pinchin share a similar general characterisation of the city of Alexandria.

Foreign capital and foreign control poured into Egypt and dominated Alexandria particularly. It was during this period that families like Cavafy's entered the city and that foreign travellers...visited Alexandria. At the "Hotel d'Europe" English ladies and their beaux could holiday almost in the manner to which they had become accustomed in Paris or Rome. Visitors included the famous, such as Flaubert - "Alexandrie d'ailleurs est presque un pays européen, tant il y a d'européens. (Pinchin, 1989: 25)

Keeley who visited Alexandria in 1973 in order to conduct research related to Cavafy's poetry remarks that

...I tried to make myself believe that the ugly reality I was seeing masked the presence of another city, more real in its way, a city open to those who could bring to it an imaginative vision, a mythical sensibility if you will, akin to Cavafy's...
and exemplified in recent English letters by E M Forster and Lawrence Durrell. But the mask, the surface reality, was so unlike the literary images I brought with me, so immediate and harsh in its effect, that it frustrated any imaginative projection...The surface of Alexandria is now Arabic once again — Arabic and little else. (Keeley, 1977: 4-5)

It is clear from the above quotations that Keeley and Pinchin perceived of Cavafy's Alexandria as a cosmopolitan (European) city, and in many respects they were right. As the previous substantive chapters have indicated, Alexandria was the centre of European commercial and financial capital and the residence of the foreign communities in Egypt. In fact, Tsirkas also holds a similar perspective on the city during Cavafy's life. (Tsirkas, 1973) In this respect, therefore, the environment within which Cavafy lived and worked was quite universal or at least bourgeois European. Thus, it is easy to see why Cavafy's poetry would reflect various universal or bourgeois issues that relate to individual existence, struggle and achievement. Nevertheless, this study has argued in the substantive chapters that the modern history of the Greek community in Alexandria was characterised by socio-political, ideological and economic contradictions. Clearly such contradictions must have had some effect on Cavafy. This is especially so as they reflected the immediate socio-cultural environment within which Cavafy lived. Keeley and Pinchin's perception of Alexandria, however, derives almost entirely from accounts by other European travellers and literary figures such as Forster and Durrell. The contradictions that characterised the Greek community, therefore, do not constitute part of the general analytical framework within which they interpret Cavafy's poetry.

At this point it might be of interest to point out that Alexander Kitroeff (1983), in his account of the socio-cultural environment within
which Cavafy worked, shares a similar perspective on Alexandria as that of Keeley and Pinchin. For Kitroeff, Alexandria during the life of Cavafy exemplified "...a 'European' or, as has been called, a 'cosmopolitan' culture." (Kitroeff, 1983: 15) Kitroeff goes on to account for the emergence of such a culture and notes that

This culture resulted from the penetration of European capital into Egypt, which brought with it western "ideas and civilization", all readily accepted by the group of foreigners most closely associated with European capital, the compradore bourgeoisie. (Kitroeff, 1983: 15)

Kitroeff, however, also subsumes the Greek community in Alexandria into the wider category of Europeans whom he characterises as representing a "compradore bourgeoisie". (Kitroeff, 1983: 12 and 18) In fact, Kitroeff notes that

...ethnic barriers were not allowed to obscure optimum business efficiency. In local government, the Europeans shared in the administration of the International Municipality of Alexandria...Social life centred around the prestigious Mohammed Ali Club, where European merchants, bankers, and businessmen mingled...Status, determined by purse, could be judged by appearances made at various garden parties or at the European theatre...Several other clubs and societies for the promotion of the arts also had a mixed European membership. These manifestations were relative to the way of life of the compradore bourgeoisie...Alexandria was therefore a kind of crucible, as the poet George Seferis once described it, a melting-pot for a variety of cultures which fused with the legacies of the Enlightenment to form a cosmopolitan culture where the values associated with a "progressive bourgeoisie" still lived on after the First World War. (Kitroeff, 1983: 17)

Thus, it is possible to conclude that Kitroeff's characterisation of the immediate socio-cultural environment within which Cavafy lived and worked, the Greek community in Alexandria, is in many respects similar to that underlying Keeley's and Pinchin's interpretation of Cavafy's poetry. It is not surprising, therefore, that Kitroeff dismisses Tsirkas' interpretation of Cavafy's poetry as representing "...a narrow Hellenocentric approach". (Kitroeff, 1983: 11)
It may be possible to argue, however, that Keeley and Pinchin's interpretation of Cavafy's poetry represents a particular style of literary criticism which is primarily concerned with "universal" issues and ideas. In this respect, therefore, their focus on Cavafy's cosmopolitan (European) socio-cultural environment can be attributed to their literary style. Kitroeff, however, writes as a socio-economic historian and it is thus necessary to outline the methodological framework which underlies his characterisation of Cavafy's Alexandria.

At this point it is of some interest to note that Kitroeff's characterisation of Alexandria coincides with Vatikiotis' account of the only period during which liberalism and Europeanisation were able to take root in Egyptian society - the period of British military rule. (Vatikiotis, 1969: 178 and 203) As it was argued in the Introduction to this study, however, Vatikiotis' historical interpretation of modern Egypt derives from the adoption of a particular methodological framework which itself derives from the functionalist-orientalist paradigm in Middle East studies. Thus, it is possible to suggest that Kitroeff's methodological orientation shares certain assumptions with the functionalist-orientalist paradigm. This is particularly so with regard to his characterisation of the Greek community which is subsumed into a general conceptualisation of the European communities. In this respect, Kitroeff relies on such a priori essentialist categories as "European" and "compradore bourgeoisie" in order to characterise the entire Greek community in Alexandria, and thus reproduces inadvertently the functionalist-orientalist paradigm. This is despite the fact that Kitroeff chooses to characterise the Europeans in Alexandria as compradors while Vatikiotis sees them as representing European progress.
and modernisation. At a methodological level, the two accounts are identical.

The common element in Kitroeff's and Vatikiotis' analysis is the fact that neither allows for possible contradictions to emerge in their respective accounts of historical development. Both scholars adopt an approach in which communities - whether they be Egyptian society or the Greeks in Alexandria - are perceived in essentialist terms. This is despite the fact that Kitroeff claims to rely on a Marxist analysis and quotes extensively from Althusser's and Poulantzas' work. (Kitroeff, 1983: 12 and 18) In fact, of course, it could be argued that it is Kitroeff's reliance on this structuralist variant of Marxism which leads him to produce ultimately an essentialist (functionalist) empiricist account of historical development.

In distinct contrast to Kitroeff's characterisation of the Greek community in Alexandria, this study has argued at both an analytical and substantive level that the dialectic of centre-periphery relations generated important contradictions in the historical development of the community. In fact, the central chapters of this study highlighted the important conflicts and contradictions that characterised the Greek community of Alexandria during the nineteenth century. Furthermore, this study has argued that it was due to the existence of such important divisions within the community that the Greeks in Alexandria were able to survive a number of crises and continued to prosper until the mid-twentieth century. Had the community been characterised solely by commercial capital, for example, its economic and social status in Egyptian society would have declined dramatically after the British military occupation and the hegemony of European finance capital. It is in this respect, therefore, that this study tends to agree with Tsirkas'
interpretation of Cavafy's poetry. For Cavafy was not only the son of a prominent member of the Greek commercial bourgeoisie in Alexandria, but he was also an intellectual and a poet who could observe and analyse the process of historical transformation taking place in his city. As with all historical change, the development of the Greek community during the nineteenth century was also a process that was characterised by contradictions.

It is possible to argue that Kitroeff is primarily concerned to characterise only a particular period - 1882 to the 1930s - in the Greek community's modern history. As previous substantive chapters and the first section of this Conclusion have indicated, this was a period during which the pro-British Greek financial oligarchy gradually gained power and eventually dominated the affairs of the Greek community in Alexandria. However, the preceding substantive arguments have also indicated that the final triumph of the financial oligarchy did not take place until 1900, and especially after the establishment of the Greek Chamber of Commerce in 1901. In other words, this was a period which exemplified clearly the contradictions and struggles between the various sections of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria. It is precisely for this reason, therefore, that this Conclusion referred to the poetry of Cavafy, which in some respects reflects the type of contradictions that characterised the community. Thus, it is possible to conclude that Kitroeff's characterisation of this period is inadequate at both the conceptual and substantive level. At a substantive level, it is clear from this study that the so-called compradorial bourgeoisie (financial oligarchy) did not achieve hegemony over the affairs of the community until after 1900. At a conceptual level, the adoption of an approach
that emphasises homogeneity clearly fails to grasp the dynamics of a community which is characterised by contradiction and conflict.

These inadequacies in Kitroeff's analytical framework derive in part from the adoption of the functionalist-orientalist paradigm which leads him to a conceptualisation of the Greek community solely in terms of the ideological and self-defined ethnic characteristics produced by the community itself. Thus, Kitroeff accepts a priori that the Greek community in Alexandria constituted an ideologically cohesive socio-cultural entity which can be analysed as a single unit. It is, of course, precisely at this level that Cavafy's poetry is invaluable to the socio-economic historian. For as indicated above, Cavafy attempts to destroy the myth of a single ethnic identity and solidarity, and instead emphasises the existence of different ideological and ethnic conceptualisations within the same Greek community. This is clearly Tsirkas' interpretation of Cavafy's poem In the Year 200 BC.

Thus, it is possible to conclude that Kitroeff fails to grasp the manner in which the different sections of Greeks in Alexandria relied upon different "ethnic" characteristics and aspects of Hellenic history in order to legitimate their authenticity. The community's "ethnic" characteristics were constructed and re-constructed in relation to the new situations that prevailed in the wider society. Thus, the conceptualisation of the Greek community in Alexandria as a homogeneous ethnic category leads to a serious misunderstanding of the dynamics which characterised this community. Dynamics, it might be added, which gave the community the strength to survive and persist as an "ethnic" entity despite the important transformations experienced by Egyptian society.
Merchant and interest-bearing capital in many respects exemplified the primary economic activities of the Greek entrepreneurs in Alexandria. It was the respective identification with these same two forms of capital which also enabled the different sections of the Greek entrepreneurs to enhance their relative status within the community and in the society at large. These "twin brothers" of Marx, therefore, ought to constitute the focus of an analysis which is concerned to grasp the dynamics and transformations of the Greek community in Alexandria. For it was the specific manner in which merchant and interest-bearing capital were reproduced in the wider social formation which also structured the nature of the contradictions within the Greek community.

The specificity of the reproduction of these two forms of capital, of course, was itself determined by the the specificity of Egypt's integration into the global capitalist economy. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the characterisation of the Greek community in Alexandria, whether in the nineteenth or twentieth centuries, ought to derive from the inter-relationship between two styles of analysis: first, the dialectic of centre-periphery relations, and second, the relationship between the construction and re-construction of the "ethnic" community and the transformations experienced by the wider social formation. It is hoped, of course, that this present study has succeeded in employing such an analytical framework in the discussion of the socio-economic activities and role of the Greek community in Alexandria during the nineteenth century.
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I. Minutes of the 1843 Meeting of the Greek Community in Alexandria (in Greek from Radopoulos, 1928: 12-4)

ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΟΝ (*)

*Επετείς την συνέλευσιν τῆς Εἰκοστῆς πέμπτης Ἀπριλίου τοῦ ἔτους Χιλιοστοῦ ὑποκατοστοῦ τεσσαρακοστοῦ τρίτου ἐν τῷ Συνοδικῷ τοῦ Ἀγίου Σάββα περί σχολείου παρόντων τῶν ὑπομαινομένων συνδρομητῶν ἐγένοντο αἱ ἐξής προτάσεις καὶ ἀποφάσεις:

*Εποτάνθη να βεβαιωθῇ διʼ ἡ συνδρομή νὰ ένεωτὲ ὑποχρεωτικὴ τόσον διὰ τὸν παρόντα χρόνον καθὼς καὶ διὰ τοὺς ἐκακολούθους ἐν ὅσο ὑπάρχῃ αὐτῷ τὸ σχολεῖον, χωρὶς κανένας νὰ ἡμιορῇ νὰ ἀποποιηθῇ τὴν πληρωμὴν τῆς συνδρομῆς του.

*Εποτάνθη τι πρέπει να διδάσκεται εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ σχολεῖον καὶ ἀπεφασίζθη να διδάσκεται χωρὶς παρεκτροφή, ἡ Ἐλληνικὴ Γλώσσα διὰ Διδασκάλου Αλληλοδιδακτικοῦ καὶ Ἐλληνικοῦ καὶ Γαλλικοτάκτου ὅπου τὴν σήμερον αἱ συνδρομαί ἄρκουσιν, καὶ εἰς τὸ μέλλον προσγειοφοροῦται τὰ εἰσελθόμενα νὰ διδαχῶσθαι καὶ ἄλλα μαθήματα.

*Εποτάνθη μὲλέτη να συστηθῇ ἀντιπροσωπεία ὅλων τῶν συνδρομητῶν, διὰ τὸ δύσκολον τῶν Γενικῶν Συνελεύσεων ἐποτάνθη νὰ διωτισθῇ Πρόεδρος αὐτῆς ο ἐκλαμπρότατος κύριος ΜΙΧΑΗΛ ΤΟΣΙΤΕΛΛΑΣ καὶ ἔγινε δεκτὸς παμφυλῆς.

*Εποτάνθη νὰ γίνῃ ἐκλογὴ διάδεκτα ἀντιπροσώπων ὅλων τῶν συνδρομητῶν, ὅπως να διοργανίση τὰ τοῦ Σχολείου γενικώς, κατὰ τὴν ἁνατέρπω βάσην τῆς Διδασκαλίας καὶ ἐνταυτῶ να διοργανισθῇ αὐτὴ ἢ ἱδία ὡς πρὸς τὴν διαχείριση τῆς ἐπιτροπικῆς ὑπηρεσίας καθ’ ὅλον τὸ διάστημα τοῦ χρόνου ἀρχικοῦ ἀπὸ τὴν σημείαν ὅπου συστήθη τὸ σχολεῖον αὐτῷ τὸ κοινὸν καὶ ἀρχίσως καὶ ἀνέφερον τὰ μαθήματα καὶ ἐκλέχθησαν παμφυλῆς οἱ ἀκόλουθοι:

*Ιωάννης Γ. Ἰβρος, Ἀναστάσιος Σωτήρης, Δημήτριος Ἀργυρίδης, Γεώργιος Πετρεμαλτζόγλου, Νικόλαος Τζάκαλης, Δημήτριος Κασδαγήλης, Σταμάτης Πρώτος, Γεώργιος Μινώτος, Ιωάννης Μπαμπούρης, Μιχαλός Καλογιάννης, Δημήτριος Ποτέσοφος καὶ Γεώργιος Ἀδέκ.

*Εγινεν ἐπὶ τέλους δεκτὴ ἡ πρώτῃ πρότασις ὅτι ἡ συνδρομὴ θέλει εἰναι ὑποχρεωτικὴ δι’ ὅλον τὸν καίρον καθ’ ὅλον ἄρκει αὐτῷ τὸ σχολεῖον χωρὶς νὰ ἡμιορῇ κανένας νὰ ἀποποιηθῇ αὐτὴν τὴν πληρωμὴν τῆς συνδρομῆς του.

*Διὰ τὸ δύσκολον τοῦ νὰ συγκρότησαι ἡ συνέλευσιν πλῆρης μὲ ὅλους τοὺς συνδρομητὰς καθὼς ἀπεδείχθη εἰς τὴν παρούσαν περιπτώσιν ἀποφασίζεται ἵνα καθ’ ὅλον συνέλευσιν ἤτε ἡσύχασεν συγκροτεῖται χρονικῶς ἀργοῦ καταργηθῆ ἢ ἢ ’Εκκλησίας εἰς ὅλον κυριακά κατὰ συνέχειαν καὶ καθ’ αὐτὸν τὸν κρόσου προσκόλληθαι τοῦ συνδρομῆτα, θέλουσιν συστήσας πλῆρην τὴν συνέλευσιν ἰκανήν, δοὺς μέλη συνάδους εἰς αὐτὴν καὶ τὰ διέλευσαν ἀδύνατα ἐκεῖθεν ἢ ἢ ἄρας νὰ παραδοῦναι ἀποφασίζωσι τὰς πράξεις τῆς συνελεύσεως.

*Εποτάνθη εἰς τὴν ἱδίαν συνέλευσιν καὶ περὶ Νοσοκομείου ὑπόθεσιν καὶ ἁρέ τοῦ ἑνίσχυσθη ἁρόκυτος ἀπεφασίζθη διʼ ὅλοις ἀντιπρόσωποι καὶ Πρόεδρος νὰ ἐνεργήσουν καὶ τοῦ Νοσοκομείου τὰ πάντα καὶ τὴν ἐπιτροπικὴν διαχείρισθην καθὼς τὰ τοῦ σχολεῖον, καὶ διὰ τὰ μέσα τὰ ὅποια χρειάζοντα ἤς ὅρων συντήρησιν τοῦ νὰ γίνῃ
μία καταγραφή προαιρετικής συνδρομής, ή όποια και αυτή να είναι κατά τόν διόν τρόπον ύποχρεωτική ώσ και έκεινη τοῦ σχολείου.

«Επει τέλος ἀπεφασίσθη ὅτι εἰς κάθε συνέλευσιν τόσον γενικήν ὅσον καὶ τῶν ἀντιφασίστων, θέλει ἀποφασίζεται διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν πλειώνων κάθε πρώτας καὶ ὑπόθεσις καὶ ἡ μειοψηφία θέλει εἶναι ὑπόχρεος νὰ συνυπογράψῃ μὲ τὴν πλειοψηφίαν τὰ ἀποφασισθέντα».

ΥΠΟΓΡΑΦΑΙ:

«Μ. Τοσίτζας, Ν. Στουρνάρης, Ι. Κανακάδης, Ι. Γ. "Ϊβος, Ν. Τζίκαλης, Μ. Καλογιάννης, Κυριάκος Στ. Τσιπέκου, Δημ. Κάσδρης, Γ. Μινιάτος, Α. Σωτήρη, Δ. 'Αργυρίδης, Γ. Πετρεμπίτζεγλου, Ν. Κυρι- λάκης, Έμμ. Βλαχάκης, Σ. Δημητρίου, Δημ. Κορίτσης, 'Αβραάμ Χρόνιας, Γεώργιος Κεχράς, Μ. Μαύρος, Κ. Σαρής, Ν. Πλατίδης, Γεώργιος Μπάτας, Γεώργιος Δημητρίου, Κυριάκος Γεωργίου, Γεώργιος 'Αργυρής, Πρωτοσώγγελος Νικηφόρος, Γεώργιος Μορίδης, 'Αθανάσιος Κοκκιλάνης, Κώστ. Καλογιάννης, 'Α. Οξενόμος, 'Ι. Τζεμβιάνιδης, 'Αμάν 'Αμπέτ, 'Η. Παπαδόπουλος, Κώστ. Μιχαήλ, Δ. Κουβαράς, Γ. Μπούζογκλέης, Πανταζής Κούβογιαννόπουλος, 'Ιωάν. Χ" Νικολάου Παππίδης.»
Translation into French of Appendix I.
(From Politis, 1929: 262-4)

« A l’Assemblée du 23 avril de l’année 1843, tenue dans la grande salle de Saint-Sabbas au sujet de l’école, en présence des sous-mentionnés membres payants, les propositions et décisions suivantes ont été prises :

« Il est proposé de fixer que la cotisation sera obligatoire, aussi bien pour l’année courante que pour celles à venir, pour autant que l’école existera, sans que personne puisse décliner le paiement de sa cotisation.

« Il a été question du programme d’enseignement de l’école et l’on a décidé d’y faire enseigner sans exception la langue grecque, par un instituteur et un professeur, ainsi que l’italien et le français, attendu que les souscriptions suffisaient et à l’avenir, avec l’accroissement des revenus, d’y professer aussi d’autres matières.

« Étant donné qu’il doit instituer une représentation de tous les membres, par suite de la difficulté de réunir des Assemblées générales, il a été proposé et accepté à l’unanimité de nommer président de cette commission S. E. M. Michel Tossizza.

« Il a été aussi proposé d’élire douze représentants qui auraient pour tâche d’organiser en général les questions relatives à l’école, suivant le programme d’enseignement sus-indiqué. En même temps, cette commission devra s’organiser, de manière à pouvoir entreprendre l’administration de cette école commune, à partir du moment où celle-ci sera instituée et où les cours auront commencé. Ont été élus à l’unanimité :


« Enfin a été acceptée la première proposition suivant

1. Cette phrase ne doit pas être interprétée comme indiquant qu’il n’existait pas encore d’école grecque à Alexandrie en 1843. Elle se réfère seulement à la fondation de l’« école commune », c’est-à-dire de celle appartenant à la Communauté. Mais une école grecque existait déjà avant cette date à Alexandrie. Le fait est prouvé par les relevés tirés des procès-verbaux de la Communauté qui mentionnent « Copie des Comptes de gestion de l’école et de l’hôpital », remis à la Commission par les anciens administrateurs de ces établissements. (Voir p. 265.)
laquelle la cotisation est obligatoire pendant toute la durée de l'école, sans que personne puisse en décliner le paiement.

« En raison de la difficulté à réunir l'Assemblée complète de tous les membres comme le prouvent les circonstances actuelles, il a été décidé que chaque Assemblée qui se réunira après que, pendant deux dimanches consécutifs des convocations auraient été lues à l'église, sera considérée comme ayant obtenu le quorum nécessaire, quel que soit le nombre des membres présents les absents devant consentir sans discussion aux décisions ainsi prises.

« Dans la même Assemblée a été soulevée aussi la question de l'hôpital et, après discussion, il a été décidé que les mêmes représentants et président se chargeaient de sa gestion et de toute question s'y rapportant, comme il a été fait pour l'école. Quant aux moyens nécessaires à son entretien, il a été convenu d'ouvrir une souscription facultative, qui devra devenir obligatoire comme celle de l'école.

« Enfin, il a été arrêté, qu'à toute réunion, soit de l'Assemblée générale des membres, soit de la Commission représentative, chaque proposition ou question sera prise à la majorité des voix, la minorité étant obligée de souscrire aux décisions de la majorité ».

M. Tossizza.
N. Stournaris.
J. Cangadis.
J. G. Ivos.
N. Tzacalis.
M. Caloyannis.
Kyriacos Tsapékou.
Démètre Casdagli.
G. Minotto.
A. Sotiri.
D. Argyridis.

Georges Dimitriou.
Kyriacos Georgiou.
Georges Argyris.
Protos. Nicéphore.
Georges Moridis.
Ath. Cokilanis.
C. Caloyannis.
A. Economos.
J. Sivitanidis.

G. Pestemaltzoglou.
N. Kytrilakis.
Emm. Vlachakis.
S. Dimitriou.
Dém. Cortessis.
Abraham Chronias.
Georges Kechras.
M. Mavros.
C. Sarris.
N. Platidias.
Georges Botas.

Arian Abel.
E. Papadopoulos.
Const. Michel.
D. Couvaras.
G. Botzoghélia.
Pantazis Coutsoyanopoulos.
Jean Hadjinicolaeu Pappidia.
II. The 1854 Founding Statutes of the Greek Community in Alexandria
(Copy of the original in Greek)
[N.B. pages 6 & 7 missing from original]
Η Κοινοβουλευτική Κάνονισμος συνιστάται κατά τους κανόνες Κοινοβουλευτη Κοινοβουλευτικού καθεστώτος. Καθ' όλα τον χώρο και σε όλους τους προσωπικούς τοις χώρων, αποκλείεται ο προσωπικός καθεστώτος και αναπτύσσεται η κοινωνική κατανομή και καθάριση. Αποτελείται από τον πρόεδρο του και τον αμελτήρη του και την αρχή τον πρόεδρο του και τον αμελτήρη του και την αρχή.

1. Η Κοινοβουλευτική Κάνονισμος συνιστάται κατά τους κανόνες Κοινοβουλευτη Κοινοβουλευτικού καθεστώτος. Καθ' όλα τον χώρο και σε όλους τους προσωπικούς τοις χώρων, αποκλείεται ο προσωπικός καθεστώτος και αναπτύσσεται η κοινωνική κατανομή και καθάριση. Αποτελείται από τον πρόεδρο του και τον αμελτήρη του και την αρχή τον πρόεδρο του και τον αμελτήρη του και την αρχή.

2. Η Κοινοβουλευτική Κάνονισμος συνιστάται κατά τους κανόνες Κοινοβουλευτη Κοινοβουλευτικού καθεστώτος. Καθ' όλα τον χώρο και σε όλους τους προσωπικούς τοις χώρων, αποκλείεται ο προσωπικός καθεστώτος και αναπτύσσεται η κοινωνική κατανομή και καθάριση. Αποτελείται από τον πρόεδρο του και τον αμελτήρη του και την αρχή τον πρόεδρο του και τον αμελτήρη του και την αρχή.

3. Η Κοινοβουλευτική Κάνονισμος συνιστάται κατά τους κανόνες Κοινοβουλευτη Κοινοβουλευτικού καθεστώτος. Καθ' όλα τον χώρο και σε όλους τους προσωπικούς τοις χώρων, αποκλείεται ο προσωπικός καθεστώτος και αναπτύσσεται η κοινωνική κατανομή και καθάριση. Αποτελείται από τον πρόεδρο του και τον αμελτήρη του και την αρχή τον πρόεδρο του και τον αμελτήρη του και την αρχή.
τὰς ἐροῦλευσις του, ὡς ἐπιτροπον, παρεκτὸς
λόγῳ ὡς ἢλος ἢ ἀποσωσις ἢ ἄλλα καὶ δυτικὴ ὡς ἢ
γέριας ἢ ἀφετέρους ἢ ἀπὸ ἐπιθέσεις, ἀρνηθῆ ἢ ἐπελεγ
απάς, ὑσεῖνα νὰ προτείνῃ ἐγγράφως πρὸς τὴν
Κοινότητα τὸν κατάλληλον προσωφήνον ἀντικατα
εὐθέν του, ἢς παραδεκτος—γενόμενος; ἦλει
αὐτοπρότονες μετὰ τῶν ἀνκαδέλφων τοῦ ἐπιτρ
πων ἦλερ πρὸς πνεύμων ἔκλεγεν ἢ ἀλλος ἀριστότο
ἐπιτροπος.

6. Ἡ Κοινότητη ἤχε καὶ Ἱερὰ Κυριακή μετὰ τὴν
θέαν λειτουργίαν ταχυδρ要知道ς τοις τα
Τράπονς της, καὶ ἐκτόπισες ἑρασίνις ἢ πέροντά
σεις τὸ καλοπόντιον ἀλλο ἢ ἐπιτροπον; καθος ἢ ἠγ
εῖ ὅτι πρὸςετε ἐπὶ ὁμοιότατον ἤπικεσιμέαν,
αὐτοπρότονες ἐπηκεία τοῦ ἀριστοκρατοῦν, ὁλο
ὁ ἐπιτροπον διὰ νὰ παρερμυθῶαι καὶ ἠθέναι ὧν
καὶ ὁμο ἐκάληθον. Ὑπὸ ὅλος ἢς τας συνε
δρασίας τὰ παρόντα ἢ ἢλ ἀποσωσις κατὰ
πλειονόμον διὰ πάντα προκειμένον ἤποθεσεις, καὶ
ὁλο ἐπιτροπον το επ ὁμοὶς ὑβρίσκοντα, νὰ ἰδ
δοντα καὶ νὰ ἑκτελῆς ψ ἀποφασίζοντα. Ὁ
Γραμματέως κρατεῖ ἢς ἐπίμητες μικής τὰ πρα
κτικὰ τῶν συνεδριάσεων ἐπογραφάθων παρὰ
του καὶ τῶν παρευρεθέντων μέλους τῆς Κοιν
ότητας.
...
.github.
19. Ο Γραφείς προς τοὺς ἄλλους: θέλει χρήματα ἀφεναικεῖται, καὶ ἐν πληρεῖ ταξίδει τα κακολογθήκε Βίβλια ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀριθμῶν.

1. Ἀρχαίοι, ὅπου κατὰ μέριδας καὶ με τὰς ἀναφορὰς ἐπιμερείας ἔθελεν, ἐπορεύθη καὶ ὁ Ἱερός Προσκύνητος, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἀρχαῖον, τοῦ Ἐλληνικοῦ Προσκυνήματος, ὡς τὸν διαμορφών, τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ἔθελον ὑπάρχειν καὶ τὰ τοῦ παρουσία τῆς ἱερατικῆς, ἀναφοράς.

2. Κατακαταλόγοις ὅπου κατὰ μέριδας καὶ μὲ τὰς ἀναφορὰς ἐπιμερείας ἔθελεν, ἐπορεύθη καὶ ὁ Ἱερός Προσκύνητος, ὡς τὸν διαμορφών, τοῦτο ἔθελον ὑπάρχειν καὶ τὰ τοῦ παρουσία τῆς ἱερατικῆς, ἀναφοράς.

3. Ἡ προενεπεικονισμοὶ ἐπιμερείας καὶ μονογραφήσεων παρὰ τοῦ Προσκυνοῦ ἡ Ἀντι-
καταστρώνει τον Ἰσόλογισμόν ἐπάνω καὶ ἐξο-
δυν ἐκάτω ἐθνικόν Καταστήματος, ὑπογρά-
μενον, παρά τον Άρμοδίων Ἐπιτρόπων καὶ παρ-
ατείρου. Ἡ δ’ Κοινότης ἐπιπολείται δύο’ ἐκ τῶν
μελῶν τῆς ὡς ἐλεγκτές διὰ να ἐπιδεικνύσαι
τοὺς ἐπικοινωνεῖν υπογραμμίζουν, καὶ όλα πάσας ἡγη-
τευκρίνεις τῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκθέσεως συνέλαβε
προσάκει διὰ τὸ καλός ἔχειν, ἢ φορτεῖται ἐκ τῆς
ἀπαράξεις τῶν ἀπλικών ἢ καταχρήσεων,
ἀν τυγχανόν παρεισφρίασαν. Τοὺς Ἰσόλογισμοὺς
δύναται ἐκάστος ἀρμοδίως να επιδεικνύσαι καὶ ἐ-
τειρότος παρατηρεῖς του, ἀναφερεῖσαν πρὸς
τὴν Κοινότητα, ὅτι περὶ τῶν δρακείας να
καίμη τὴν προσήκουσαν μενειν εἰς τὰ πρακτικα
τῆς πρώτης Συνεδρίασις τῆς.

22.

Οἱ δὲ ἐν ἑνεργείᾳ Ἐπιτρόποι εὐαίσχυναν καὶ
παρεδόθησαν εὐσυνείδος τῶν πορὸντας ἡγε-
μόνη Ἰαννίσιμον, δι’ ὅτι θέλουσαν καὶ κοινοπληθυ-
νικοῦς εἰς τοὺς αὐτούς ἀνήκοντας. Τὴν ἀρίστη
ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτῶν συζήτησαν καὶ εἰς τὴν Γι.
ληγένειν τῶν διεσκέισιν,
τῶν πρὸς ἐπιτυχήν τοῦ κοινοῦ ἀναφέροντο,
αὐτὸς δ’ ἐπιβλέπον τοῦ καρα καποδίστηρος,
παρουσιάβως πε-
ριστάς προκαλεῖσθαι—μεταφράσασθαι τινας εἰς
τὸν κανονισμὸν τοῦτον, αὖ τοιοῦτα δύναται μὲν
νὰ προταθῶσιν τοῦλοκιστὸν ἀπὸ δύο μέλη τῆς
Κοινότητος, ἀλλὰ διὰ νὰ κυρώσων ἀπαιτοῦνται.
ο Πρόεδρος της Έλληνικής Κοινότητας Μ. Τσίτσας

Τα μέλη

Κ. Θ. Νάτζιος
Γ. Ζ. Μωυσέως
Γ. Συμμαρίτης
Β. Γαργαλάς
Κ. Σπανόπουλος
Ε. Ρηγάδης
Μαργαρ. Δημητρίου
Δημήτρ. Κοτέσης
Δ. Κοιτσάρας

Ο Γραμματέας
Γ. Κορωνάς
Translation into English of Appendix II.

1. The Greek-Egyptian Community (Kovortta) is constituted by all the representatives of the national Institutions, Church, Hospital and School. The number of these representatives can be increased up to 24 in accordance with the increase of the population of the same ethnic origin [Greek] Orthodox.

2. The Community, as it legally represents all the Greek Orthodox residents here, not only administers the national institutions, and responsibly administers their funds according to the regulations, but is concerned with any other common interest, and represents them accordingly in front of political, religious and juridical authorities, and any other association or person.

3. On the first Sunday of each new year, after the holy service, there will be a General Meeting at the offices of the Community, or in a nearby large room, where the representatives will present an account of their administration during the past year, the financial accounts and developments of each of the national institutions. Following the presentation there takes place the renewal of the three-year mandate for these representatives. For the first and second years the replacement representatives are elected and from the third and following years those with seniority are rightly assumed to have been elected.

4. Those Greek Orthodox present at the General Meeting elect by a majority vote the twelve members of the executive council, who then meet and elect the new representatives for each of the institutions. The elections take place by a secret ballot.

5. None of the Greek Orthodox residents in Alexandria can refuse his responsibilities as a representative except in the case of health reasons or departure. Even for these exceptions, and once he has been elected, he is obligated to nominate in writing to the Community the name of his temporary replacement, who once he has been approved is obligated to work with the other representatives until the date of the new elections, when it will be arranged for a new permanent representative to be elected.

6. The Community meets regularly on Sundays after the holy services at its offices and extraordinarily whenever there is need for a meeting. But in these extraordinary meetings and when there is a substantive matter all the representatives must be informed by the Secretary about the appropriate date and hour. In all the meetings the members present decide according to a majority vote with regard to the matters at hand and all the representatives are obligated to respect and implement the decisions. The Secretary keeps in a special book the minutes of the meetings which are then signed by him and all those members of the executive council who were present.

[Articles 7, 8, and 9 are missing from the Greek original]

10. In addition to the financial resources of the national institutions, the Community is permitted to borrow for urgent needs with the intention of repaying from future income and always by mortgaging common property and ensuring that at least two or three of its members take on this responsibility. For the purpose of the common good, and except for the loans for urgent needs, the Community can receive, after a recommendation from one of the members of the council, money from orphaned families or others who deserve to be
assisted and from the working classes of the resident Greek Orthodox and for a predetermined period or not. Interest every three months should be paid with religious regularity according to the following rates:
From 100 Egyptian piasters to 3,000 at a rate of 12 %
From 3,000 Egyptian piasters to 10,000 at a rate of 10 %
From 10,000 Egyptian piasters to 100,000 at a rate of 8 %
More than that sum only 6 %. Receipts should be given for these loans with a duplicate to be kept by the Community.

11. In order to facilitate the affairs of the Community and in order to keep all the Community funds together, the Community will make special arrangements with a Banker or a Merchant from among the resident Greeks, in order to have an open account with mutual interest payments. As the Community borrows so it can lend, when it has extra funds and for an interest of no more than 6 % per year to the resident Greeks who are in need and offer the appropriate guarantees. For daily small expenses the Community has a treasury at its premises under the supervision and administration of one the Council members or the Secretary. The order for each payment needs to be made in writing by the appropriate representative or representatives of each of the institutions and on the basis of receipts or accounts attached to the appropriate book which is numbered in numerical order.

12. The Community should be concerned to establish a Charitable Fund, from which can be helped needy resident Greeks on a regular or irregular basis. For this fund contributions should be collected once or twice per year by two respectable persons who have been chosen by the Community and who will visit all commercial establishments and other Greeks who are in a position to contribute. It is expected that the Church will also make an appropriate contribution.

13. The Community is obligated as a first priority to complete as soon as possible the construction of the Evangelismos church and to open it for public worship. With the assistance of the appropriate committee the Community should appoint clergy and other necessary staff who could either be remunerated on a regular basis with a salary or receive donations. Through the formulation and adoption of separate regulations the community should organise the affairs of the church and all its staff. The feast of the 25th of March should be marked with all appropriate pomp and circumstance and on that day a special service should take place in memory of all those who donated to the church.

14. The Community is obligated to take care of the hospital in the best possible manner according to its means. In consultation with the appropriate committee it should ensure that if the staff is inadequate then changes should be made. Through a separate set of regulations the Community should ensure that the affairs of the hospital are well organised and the care of the patients improved gradually. Once a year, on the Sunday of the Orthodox, there should take place a special service for all those who have donated to the hospital.

15. As to the schools of the Community, it is a religious obligation that the Community ensures that none of those already existing is neglected, but to also ensure that there are gradual improvements. When financial circumstances permit the Community should ensure that
The Greek School [primary] is developed, if possible The Gymnasium [secondary] and as soon as possible to establish kindergartens for boys and girls. Because the Tossitsas family endowed the Community with grand buildings for all the schools and financial endowments for their administration, and in order to preserve their memory, the school should be called The Tossitsas School. Every year on the feast of The Three Clergy there should be a special service in the memory of them [the Tossitsas family] and other donors.

16. The Community is responsible for the cemetery and every Saturday at the cemetery church a special service should take place. A night-guard should be appointed for the cemetery. The affairs and upkeep of the cemetery should be organised by a special set of regulations. In order to assist the Greeks in Alexandria with regard to the expenditure of large sums of money at each burial, the Community should take on all such expenses and the relatives of the deceased should then repay the Community in installments. Burials will be classified into three categories according to how much the family wishes to spend. The poor will be buried for free and the expenses paid for by the church.

17. In the event that it is necessary to defend the rights and interests of the national institutions the appropriate committee and the Community as a whole should seek the assistance of the Greek Consulate. Any legal claims against the Community should also be dealt with through the Greek Consulate.

18. The offices of the Community are open on all working days and administered by the Secretary of the Community who is entrusted with the safety of the seal of the Community, the ledgers, the membership fees and all other material in the offices. The secretary signs all documents issued by the Community, as well as accounts and receipts and is thus responsible for all clerical and financial matters.

19. The Secretary is responsible for keeping in good order the following books all of which should pages marked in numerical order:

1. A book in which is recorded in detail all births, weddings and deaths of the resident Greeks and a document is issued for each and every one of them.

2. A book in which is recorded all the property owned by the Community and the financial assets of each institution and each and every major financial transaction carried out by these institutions. At the beginning the representatives should write a summary of all previous transactions and subsequently all transactions should be entered in chronological order.

3. A book with numbered carbon copies each of which has been signed by either the President or the Vice-President of the Community from which receipts are issued for each payment made to the Community or to the accounts of the Church, Hospital and School. A similar book should be kept for all payments made by the Community.

4. A book in which is recorded daily the expenditure and income of each of the institutions and at the end of each month a summary should be produced for each institution and given to the appropriate representatives.

5. A book in which is recorded with the appropriate serial number all the documents issued by the Community or received by the Community, as well as any other books needed by the Community for clerical and financial order.
20. The Secretary is responsible for ensuring that dues to the Community and the institutions are collected promptly and all other matters that concern the Community.

21. At the end of each year the Secretary is responsible for producing the accounts for each institution which are then signed by the appropriate representatives. The Community is responsible for appointing two of the members of the executive council as auditors who examine the accounts and report if all is alright and take the necessary measures if there are problems. The accounts can be inspected by any resident Greek who is also entitled to make remarks to the Community which have to be recorded in the minutes of the first General Meeting.

22. The representatives discussed and accepted the present statutes and agreed that they should be printed and distributed. The correct application of these statutes is for the benefit of all. If in due time there is need for changes in these present statutes this can be done if at least two members of the Community make a proposal. For the proposal to be accepted it requires a three-quarters majority of the total membership of the Community at the time.

Alexandria 14 (26) January, 1854

The President of the Greek-Egyptian Community

Michalis Tossitsas

The Members

K Th Natzos
George Minotos
P Soumaripas
B Georghalas
K Spanopoulos
E Rigadis
Margarita Dimitriou
Dimitris Kortesis
D Kouvaras

The Secretary

G Koronas
RÈGLEMENT

DE LA

CHAMBRE DE COMMERCE HELLENIQUE

D'ALEXANDRIE

Constitution et Objet.

Art. 1er — Une Chambre de Commerce Hellénique est fondée à Alexandrie ; elle a pour objet l'étude de toutes les questions ayant trait au développement des relations commerciales entre la Grèce et l'Egypte, et l'encouragement au commerce de la marine et de l'industrie hellénique en Égypte, au Soudan et dans la Mer Rouge.

Art. 2. — Dans ce but, la Chambre de Commerce Hellénique entrera en relations avec tout établissement de commerce de Grèce et d'autres pays et prêtera son appui moral à toutes personnes s'occupant de commerce, de marine ou d'industrie, ou pouvant contribuer au développement des échanges entre la Grèce et l'Egypte.

Plus spécialement les attributions de la Chambre de Commerce seront de :

1° Exprimer des vœux et des opinions en vue de l'amélioration de la législation hellénique relative au
Comme, à l'Industrie et à la Marine marchande ou 
étantuellement de l'abolition des dispositions légales 
qui en entraveraient le développement; exprimer aussi des 
vœux pour la fondation d'œuvres privées ou publiques 
pouvant y contribuer.

2° Echanger des informations avec toutes autres 
Chambres de Commerce ou établissements quelconques 
de la Grèce ou de l'Etranger sur la consommation locale des 
produits helléniques, les usages commerciaux et la légis- 
lation égyptienne relative au Commerce, à l'Industrie et à 
la Marine marchande.

3° S'occuper de la fondation d'écoles commerciales 
et industrielles.

4° Résoudre par voie d'arbitrage ou de transaction 
les différends dont ses membres ou des tiers confieraient 
la solution au Comité de la Chambre par un compromis 
signé par les parties en cause, avec renonciation à l'appel 
et aux formalités judiciaires.

5° Recueillir tous renseignements se rapportant au 
commerce et à la marine hellénique.

6° Soumettre aux autorités helléniques ou égyptien-
nes, par l'entremise du Consulat Hellène, des rapports 
sur des questions douanières, le transit et surtout le 
mouvement maritime, ou des travaux et questions d'utilité 
publique.

7° Fournir des renseignements sur la solvabilité des 
commerçants.

8° Certifier l'existence et le mode de travail des 
sociétés de commerce dont les circulaires ou les statuts 
ont été déposés au bureau de la Chambre de Commerce.

9° Désigner des experts aux autorités ou à des parti-
culiers sur leur demande.

10° Soumettre chaque année une liste de ses membres 
à l'autorité consulaire, liste dans laquelle seront choisis 
les juges assesseurs aux Tribunaux Mixtes tant pour les 
affaires commerciales que pour les affaires pénales.

11° Publier, si cela est possible, un bulletin périodique 
trattant de toutes les questions intéressant la Chambre de 
Commerce. Ce bulletin ainsi que toutes autre publications 
etuellenues seront distribuées à tous les membres 
sans distinction aucune.

Art. 3. — Il est interdit de discuter dans les locaux 
de la Chambre tout sujet étranger à son but.

Membres.

Art. 4. — Peuvent être membres permanents de la 
Chambre :

1° Tous les propriétaires, rentiers, commerçants, 
banquiers, industriels, armateurs, capitaines, courtiers en 
mandandises, changeurs, directeurs, agents ou représen-
tants de maisons de commerce étrangères, ou Helléniqus, 
de compagnies d'assurance et de navigation, pourvu qu'ils 
soient sujets grecs, jouissant de leurs droits civils et 
politiques.

2° Les sujets étrangers d'origine grecque.

3° Les Sociétés commerciales dont un résumé des 
statuts ou les circulaires sont déposés aux archives de la 
Chambre de Commerce.
Les Sociétés sont considérées comme une seule personne et ne peuvent être représentées que par un seul associé spécialement autorisé, sauf le cas où chacun des associés est inscrit séparément comme membre, dans lequel cas il a le droit d'assister aux séances et de voter indépendamment de la Société dont il fait partie.

Art. 5. — La Chambre de Commerce peut avoir aussi des membres honoraires ainsi que des membres correspondants, des bienfaiseurs et des donateurs.

Sont nommés membres honoraires par l'assemblée générale toutes personnes ayant rendu des services spéciaux à la Chambre de Commerce. Ces membres assistent aux séances mais ils n'ont pas droit de vote. Sont nommés bienfaiseurs ceux qui donnent en une seule fois fr. 1000 et donateurs ceux qui versent au moins fr. 200 à la caisse de la Chambre de Commerce.

Tous les commerçants grecs ou étrangers peuvent être admis comme membres correspondants.

Art. 6. — Il y a 3 classes de membres permanents.
La première paie une contribution annuelle de P.T. 300, la seconde de P.T. 100 et la troisième de P.T. 50. Les membres correspondants versent P.T. 100 par an.

Art. 7. — Tout nouveau membre permanent ou correspondant reçoit un diplôme pour lequel il est payé un droit de P.T. 20.

Art. 8. — Chaque membre doit verser le montant de sa souscription annuelle au commencement de l'année. Sont rayés de la liste des membres, par décision du Comité, ceux qui n'auront pas versé le montant de leur souscription annuelle dans le courant du premier trimestre. La décision y relative sera communiquée au représentant du Gouvernement Hellénique. On peut redevenir membre et recouvrer ses droits en payant tous les arriérés dus à la Chambre de Commerce.

Art. 9. — Ne peuvent pas être membres de la Chambre :
1° Tout commerçant hellène ayant fait faillite et n'ayant pas été réhabilité ;
2° Tout commerçant poursuivi pour banqueroute simple ou frauduleuse ;
3° Ceux qui ont subi une condamnation pour crime ou pour les délits prévus à l'art. 22 du Code Pénal.

Administration.

Art. 10. — La Chambre de Commerce est gérée par un Comité administratif composé de 24 membres au maximum et de 18 au minimum, exerçant leur profession dans la circonscription. Le Comité est élu par l'assemblée annuelle à la majorité absolue des membres présents. Si par suite d'absence, de maladie, de mort ou pour tout autre motif, le nombre des membres du Comité tombe à 18, les membres restants constituent valablement le Comité, à moins qu'ils ne préfèrent se compléter jusqu'au nombre de 24 par voie d'élection à la majorité des voix. Cette élection complémentaire s'impose si le nombre des membres se trouve réduit à moins de 18.
Le Comité se renouvelle chaque année par tiers. Deux associés inscrits sous la même raison sociale, ne peuvent être en même temps membres du Comité. Les membres sortants sont rééligibles.

**Art. 11.** — Les membres du Comité doivent être âgés de plus de 25 ans et avoir exercé leur profession pendant au moins un an à Alexandrie. Les sujets étrangers sont éligibles comme conseillers, mais ne peuvent pas former plus du tiers des membres du Comité, ni être élus comme présidents, vice-présidents, secrétaires ou caissiers de la Chambre de Commerce.

**Art. 12.** — Le Comité administratif représentant la Chambre de Commerce s'occupe de tout ce qui en fait l'objet, décide l'admission ou la non-admission des membres permanents, dresse le règlement intérieur de ses travaux, vérifie les comptes de Caisse et choisit jusqu'à la convocation de l'Assemblée Générale les remplaçants des membres dont les sièges restent vacants par suite de mort, incapacité légale, départ définitif ou de mission.

**Art. 13.** — Le Comité peut, sur des questions spéciales, avoir recours à l'opinion de sous-comités consultatifs spéciaux, composés même de personnes qui ne seraient pas membres, mais siégeant sous la Présidence d'un membre du Comité.

**Art. 14.** — Dans la première séance après l'Assemblée Générale annuelle qui procède aux élections, séance qui doit être tenue dans la huitaine de la dite Assemblée, les membres du Comité doivent élire au scrutin secret le Bureau composé d'un Président, de deux Vice-Présidents, d'un Secrétaire Général, d'un Trésorier et, si cela est nécessaire, de deux autres membres.

Dans cette même séance le Comité arrête les prévisions de dépenses de l'année proportionnellement aux ressources de la Chambre de Commerce.

**Art. 15.** — Le Comité se réunit en séance ordinaire une fois par mois et des séances extraordinaires sont convoquées quand six, au moins, des membres du Comité en font la demande par écrit.

**Art. 16.** — Les membres du Comité sont tenus d'assister aux séances; s'ils en sont empêchés, ils doivent en aviser le bureau.

Tout membre du Comité qui, sans excuse plausible et sans prévenir le bureau, s'absenterait trois fois consécutivement est considéré comme démissionnaire et le Comité, après avertissement, procédera à son remplacement.

**Art. 17.** — Le quorum nécessaire pour la validité des délibérations du Comité est fixé à la moitié de ses membres actifs; les décisions sont prises à la majorité absolue et engagent même les absents. En cas de partage des voix, celle du Président est prépondérante.

**Art. 18.** — Le Consul général de S. M. Hellénique ou le gérant du Consulat est de droit Président Honoraire de la Chambre de Commerce Hellénique. Il peut présider aux Assemblées Générales, mais n'a pas le droit de voter.
ART. 19. — Le Président de l'association préside aux séances du Comité et signe avec le secrétaire tous les procès-verbaux ainsi que toutes autres pièces émanant de la Chambre de Commerce.

ART. 20. — Le Président empêché est remplacé par le plus âgé des vice-présidents et celui-ci par son collègue, et si tous deux sont empêchés, par le plus âgé des conseillers membres du bureau.

ART. 21. — Si le secrétaire est empêché, un des deux conseillers membres du bureau le remplace.

ART. 22. — Le Trésorier pourvoit à l'encaissement des souscriptions annuelles des membres ainsi que de tout autre contribution ou don, par l'encaisseur nommé par le Comité. Il doit effectuer les paiements en vertu de mandats signés par le Président et rendre compte de sa gestion aux réunions du Comité et à l'Assemblée générale.

ART. 23. — La Direction intérieure du bureau de la Chambre de Commerce est confiée à un Directeur rémunéré nommé par le Comité. Ses fonctions ainsi que le mode de sa nomination seront régies par le règlement intérieur de la Chambre.

Assemblée Générale.

ART. 24. — Les membres de la Chambre de Commerce se réunissent une fois par an dans la première quinzaine de Mars, par convocation du Président du Comité, publiée par les journaux au moins huit jours à l'avance ; la convocation doit fixer le jour et l'heure de la réunion qui aura pour objet la lecture du rapport du Président, l'élection de commissaires pour la vérification des comptes de l'exercice écoulé, la rédaction des comptes du Trésorier, l'élection des remplaçants des membres sortants du Conseil, ainsi que toute autre proposition du Conseil.

ART. 25. — L'Assemblée Générale est valablement constituée si un quart des membres actifs y assistent ; elle prend ses décisions à la majorité absolue des voix. Si à la première convocation le nombre des membres présents n'atteint pas le quorum susmentionné, une seconde Assemblée est convoquée après un délai de 15 jours au moins et cette dernière est considérée comme valable quel que soit le nombre des membres présents.

ART. 26. — Les membres de la Chambre peuvent être convoqués au besoin en assemblée extraordinaire :
1° Si le Comité le juge à propos ;
2° Sur la demande par écrit de quelques membres de la Chambre adressée au Comité qui a le droit de l'accepter ou de la rejeter ;
3° Sur la demande écrite du quart au moins des membres de la Chambre de Commerce ; dans ce dernier cas, le Comité est tenu de convoquer l'Assemblée dans un délai de 15 jours du jour où la demande lui sera parvenue. Tous les membres de la Chambre sont avisés huit jours au moins avant la réunion et il leur est fait part de l'objet de l'assemblée extraordinaire.
Dispositions Générales.

Art. 27. — La Chambre de Commerce Hellénique étant considérée comme soumise à l'autorité du Consulat ne peut communiquer avec toute autorité grecque ou étrangère que par l'intermédiaire du Consulat.

Art. 28. — La liquidation de la Chambre de Commerce peut être décidée seulement par une assemblée Générale, composée au moins de la moitié plus un des membres actifs et la résolution doit être prise à la majorité des 3/4 des membres présents. En cas de liquidation de la Chambre, l'actif net reviendra à la Communauté Hellénique d'Alexandrie.

Art. 29. — Le présent règlement entrera en vigueur à partir de son approbation par l'Assemblée Générale ou de sa publication dans un journal grec d'Alexandrie. Il ne peut être modifié par l'Assemblée Générale qu'un an après sa mise en vigueur, mais sur la demande de la moitié au moins des membres du Comité adressée au Président, ou sur celle de 20 membres permanents de la Chambre.

Art. 30. — Le sceau de la Chambre porte au centre l'écusson aux armes nationales et en exergue les mots :

CHAMBRE DE COMMERCE HELLÉNIQUE d'ALEXANDRIE 1901.

Le règlement ci-dessus ayant été lu et approuvé on a procédé d'urgence, pour la constitution définitive de l'association, à la nomination du premier Comité, l'élection ultérieure du Comité de la Chambre étant prévue par les Statuts.

Ont été élus Membres du Comité :


Alexandrie, le 7/20 Janvier 1901.

Le Président de l'Assemblée,

N. Gennadis,
Consul Général de Grèce.

Le Secrétaire,
A. Sactouris,
Secrétaire du Consulat Général de Grèce.

A la séance du Comité tenue le 29/11 Février au Consulat de Grèce, le bureau a été constitué ainsi qu'il suit :

Le Président, Em. Benachi.
Vice-Présidents, Jean Lagonico, Sp. Pappathanassopolou.
Secrétaire, D. Tambacopulo.
Trésorier, G. Zervoudachi.
IV. Description of the material in the archives of the Greek Community of Alexandria

As it has been indicated in the Preface, this study has relied on a number of different sources in its attempt to reconstruct some of the socio-economic and political characteristics of the Greek Community in Alexandria during the nineteenth century. Given the variety of sources used and the fact that few academics have made use of the material available in Alexandria, this appendix will present a brief description of one of these sources as a means of encouraging other scholars to make use of them.

The general account of sources that was presented in the Preface indicated that the archives of the Greek Community of Alexandria contain a number of different sources albeit in a non-classified manner. It is this material which requires some additional description as it constituted an important source for this study, but due to the absence of any catalogues and organisation it was not always indicated in the footnotes and references. Essentially these archives contain three different types of material: first, quantitative indicators of the activities of the community; second, material related to the major personalities who played an important role in the history and development of the community; and third, material related to various socio-economic, educational, cultural and other activities in which either the community as an institution or groups from within the community were involved.

First: This material essentially includes balance sheets of the accounts of the various economic activities of the community as an institution over a number of years, dating back to the mid-1840s. For
example, for the period 1843 to 1855 there are annual accounts for the years 1843 to 1846 and general accounts covering the period 1847 to 1855. These balance sheets indicate the revenues of the community from various sources such as loans and donations from wealthy Greeks in Alexandria, dues paid by the members of the community, rents collected from various properties and profits from economic enterprises owned by the community as an institution. These balance sheets also indicate in some detail the expenditure of the community with regard to the various institutions that it administered. Thus, there are considerable details with regard to the community schools and hospital. For the year 1844, for example, the balance sheets indicate that the community spent 24,525.8 Egyptian Piasters in running the school and 40,669.38 Egyptian Piasters in the administration of its hospital, but had an income of 24,345.15 Egyptian Piasters and 25,750.22 Egyptian Piasters respectively for each institution. The balance sheets for 1844 also indicate that the negative balance of 15,099.81 Egyptian Piasters was covered from donations by the Tossitsas brothers, Nicolaou Stournaras and Nicolaou Tzakalis.

These accounts also include information about the number of children who attended the community schools and those patients who were treated in the community hospital. For example, the balance sheets for the year 1871 indicate that in that year 887 persons were treated in the hospital, of whom 639 were of Greek origin and of those, 113 were treated without charges. Similarly, the accounts for 1871 indicate that the school had a total of 423 children, 264 boys and 159 girls, and of those, 229 attended school without paying fees. Furthermore, this material also includes the names of all the elected councils which administered the affairs of the community from its establishment in
1843. These lists of names indicate who occupied the various administrative posts within the community and the members of the various sub-committees that were appointed in order to administer the various institutions of the community.

It should be pointed out that although this type of material has not been used extensively in this study, it was read carefully in order to obtain a general understanding of the quantitative aspects of the history of the Greek Community in Alexandria which played a central role in structuring the type of interpretation which has been presented in the preceding chapters. The reason for not reproducing this quantitative material in this study is primarily due to the fact that practically all those who have written any kind of account of the Greek Community in Alexandria have reproduced in great detail all these quantitative indicators and names of the administrative councils and their respective sub-committees in their studies. [see Politis (1929 & 1931) and Radopoulos (1928)]

Nevertheless, the significance of such quantitative material for this study is that it contributed to a better understanding of the importance of donations in maintaining a positive balance in the accounts of the community and thus the socio-political benefits derived by those who made the donations. The names of Tossitsas and Averoff, for example, appear quite regularly in these quantitative accounts and in some respects explain their socio-political prominence within the community. This is despite the fact that they were not necessarily the wealthiest Greek merchants in Alexandria. Similarly, the number of patients who were treated without charges by the community hospital and the number of children who attended the community schools without paying fees also confirm the fact that the Greek Community of Alexandria was not composed
entirely of wealthy merchants. Such examples clearly contributed to a better understanding of the characteristics and dynamics of the Greek Community in Alexandria and this understanding emerges in the particular type of interpretation presented in this study.

Second: This material includes different types of printed pamphlets, newspaper and magazine clippings, pages torn out of books, and pictures which have been placed in a number of boxes entitled Major Benefactors. One such large box included material related to prominent Alexandria Greeks who lived during the nineteenth century and it was this box which was examined in great detail. Chapter Two of this study which presented a number of biographies of prominent Alexandria Greeks relied extensively on this material although it was not always possible to provide the appropriate references. For example, a fifteen page article written by Kosti E Parasyra (1938) on Count Ioannis d'Anastasy was found in that box and was used in the writing of the biography of d'Anastasy in Chapter Two. The use of this item, of course, was given the appropriate reference and the article itself is listed in the bibliography. When the material, however, consisted of pages torn out of books, with no reference, or clippings from newspapers or journals, again with no references, it was not possible to provide the appropriate references within this study.

The significance of this material is that a detailed reading of all the bits and pieces provided a more comprehensive picture of each of these prominent Alexandria Greeks than could have been obtained solely by reference to the published accounts. The reading of numerous newspaper clippings in Arabic, French, English and Greek on the activities of George Averoff, for example, played a central role in the characterisation of this Alexandria Greek merchant which is presented in
this study. Similarly, the diverse nature of this material enabled the author of this study to determine to a better extent whether a particular published account of an Alexandria Greek merchant reflected adequately the role and activities of the merchant or solely the perspective of the author of the book.

It should be pointed out, however, that all the information that was collected from this box and used in the writing of the biographies in Chapter Two was also checked against published material which relates specifically to accounts of the life histories of prominent Alexandria Greeks during the nineteenth century. One important such source, for example, is the work of F F Oddi (1911) which corroborates most of the information that was derived from the Major Benefactors box in the Greek Community Archives. It should also be noted that whenever there is a discussion of particular activities of a prominent Alexandria Greek in other chapters of this study, and this discussion relies upon published sources, the information used has been checked against the numerous bits and pieces that were found in the archives. If no corroborative reference was found in the archives, then invariably the information in the published source was excluded from the account presented in this study. It is possible to suggest, therefore, that this body of material, although un-classified and collected in a haphazard manner, constitutes an important source against which researchers can check the relative authenticity of the published material relating to the particular activities and role of prominent Alexandria Greeks.

Third: This material includes a variety of printed and handwritten documents which constitute an important source for an understanding of the various economic, cultural, educational, and social activities of the Greek Community as an institution and those of particular groups
within the community. Once more the problem with this material is that has not been classified or catalogued and in most cases there is no indication of the source from which the material was derived. For example, there is a twelve page typed document which lists all the different economic activities in which Alexandria Greeks were involved and under each category it provides the names and addresses of those Greeks who were involved in that particular activity. The document has no author and no reference to any sources, but at the bottom of the last page it has a date: December, 1890. The document lists forty-three different economic activities in which Greeks were involved and thus confirms that the Greeks in Alexandria were involved in practically all aspects of the Egyptian economy. Clearly such a document has a particular value in any attempt to grasp the economic role of the Greeks in Alexandria, even if it is difficult to provide exact references for its use.

Another document, this time handwritten, consisting of seven large sheets, lists the number of Greeks involved in different occupations in Alexandria, Zagazig, Minya, Mansura, Suez, Port Tawfiq, Port Said and Isma'iliyya. The document has neither an author nor indicates any sources, but unfortunately it does not have a date either. Nevertheless, it lists forty-three different occupations in which Greek males were involved and seven occupations in which Greek females were involved in these cities and towns. The occupations include the medical profession, trade, education, crafts, photography, workers, sailors, restaurants, etc. Clearly such a document, even without a date, confirms that the Greeks in Alexandria as well as in other Egyptian rural towns were involved in a variety of professions and economic occupations and thus reflected practically all the different aspects of
the Egyptian economy and society. It should also be pointed out that the non-appearance of the occupation of peasant-producer does not appear in any of the documents is also of particular importance. This is especially so since the occupations of landowner and rural merchant appear regularly in all the documents and with significantly large numbers attached to them.

This category of material also includes a number of documents produced by various Greek associations, trade unions and other socio-cultural organisations in the city of Alexandria during the nineteenth century. For example, there are a number of printed documents produced by the Greek Cigarette Workers Association. All of these documents are dated sometime during the decade of the 1890s and reflect the wide variety of activities of this association. There are several membership lists, three different copies of the internal regulations of the association, individual sheets announcing particular cultural activities that were to be held at the premises of the association, etc. Such documents, of course, indicate the extent to which this association was active during the decade of the 1890s and also confirm that the Greek community in Alexandria was clearly a class-based society which was sufficiently developed for both capital and labour to have organised their respective organisations.

A different type of document that is to be found under this category of material is the various anonymous printed essays relating to particular events that occurred during the nineteenth century history of the community. Some of these documents consist of only two pages while others are as long as fifty and seventy pages. It appears that most of these documents or pamphlets were produced by various interest groups who found it necessary to present their point of view with regard to
particular events such as the elections of a new council or of a new Patriarch, etc. Some of the substantive documents that consist of a number of pages have been used quite extensively in this study and have been referenced. For example, Anon (1862) is a printed pamphlet which consists of seventy-one (small) pages which discusses in great detail and with the aid of documentation the events that took place at the general meeting of the community in that same year and thus constitutes an important source that has to be contrasted to the various published accounts of these events. (see chapter five) Many of these documents, however, consist of only two or three pages with no documentation or references and clearly represent the equivalent of an underground press. In some cases it is possible to determine who the author or authors might be, but in other cases it is difficult to do so.

Nevertheless, and despite the difficulty in providing references for all these documents that constitute part of this category of material in the Greek Community Archives in Alexandria, they do constitute an invaluable source for an understanding of the development of the community during the nineteenth century. In terms of this study, this material constituted an invaluable source for the interpretation and analysis that is presented, and especially with regard to Chapter Five. Of course, as with all other such material, it was checked against the published sources and in many cases the information in the published sources was checked against this material.

It should be clear from the above brief description of the material in the Alexandria Greek Community archives that the absence of any systematic classification or cataloguing should not deter scholars from using them. The material involved is probably the most important single source for any general appreciation of the activities and history of the
Greek community as an institution, the various groups and organisations and many of the prominent Greeks in that city. It is needless to add that if such material was to be catalogued and classified, it would greatly enhance the usefulness of this archive.