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Abstract
In 1834, when the Aegean island of Samos became a Principality under the Ottoman rule, new balances, with regards to the distribution of power, were established, as well as a unique educational system, clearly distinguished from that of the Orthodox Christian Communities of the Ottoman Empire. The article highlights, these new aspects of the educational history of the Samian Principality, through the bidirectional relationship between education and elite powers, political, economic and religious, as established: a) at the local level consolidated by the Prince, the Metropolitan and the local political parties of the Principality, which represent organized socioeconomic interests, b) but also on the international axes set by Greece, the Ottoman Empire and the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The research records the effects of such relations in the formation of the institutional framework and the prevailing educational ideology of the Principality.
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1. The existing literature, aims, objectives, methodology
This paper focus on the Principality of Samos, a ‘semi-autonomous’ peculiar regime with Ottoman suzerainty (Svoronos 1903a). This study concerns the period since the establishment of the Principality (1834) up to its catalysis (1913) and aims to: a) the
interpretation of the power relations as formed in the Principality in different periods and in their different contexts. b) The imprinting of networks of elite powers in education. c) The ‘typological’ classification of Samos’ model, concerning the relations between education and the actors of power. This attempt is significant because that the education of the Principality of Samos constitutes a unique example. Since its formation is based on the local Samian statutory framework, which differentiates the education of the Principality from that of the Greeks who lived in the Ottoman Empire (Svoronos 1903a). As a result, the networks of elite powers are differentiated in the context of the Principality. However, this study focuses on elite powers, does' not suggest an underestimation of people’s riots. E.g. the Samian people riot in 1849 (in the wake of international uprisings of 1848) which, in this study, is accessed as a mark of an historical incision that inaugurates a new historical sub-period (PGAS 1841-1849).

Furthermore the existing literature concerning the relation between the notions power and education is full of relating references. So Kestere & Rubene et al. (2015: 5) claim: “Education and power relations are closely intertwined: education is both the legitimiser and the instrument of power, as well as the generator of power relations. Education can be explained through power, and power can be understood through education”.

The term elite is described by many scientists with a variety of different and sometimes contradictory theories (Sola 2000). Sola argues that, contrary to the common belief that in the modern era elite theory is a product of late 19th and early 20th century, we should firstly mention the precursors of 18th and 19th century such as A. de Saint-Simon, Aug. Comte, A. de Tocqueville and H. Taine who, often in their respective social-political and historical-political analyses, “had the occasion to use the concepts of élites and managerial classes as an indispensable key for interpreting epoch-making phenomena such as revolutions and the attempts for restoration, the imposition of the bourgeoisie and the class struggle” (Martinelli 2009b: 5).

Significant elite theorists at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries are: G. Mosca, V. Pareto, M. Weber and R. Michels. G. Mosca defines elite as a small in number leading social group. He argues that, the organized minority is imposed on the unorganized majority, monopolizes and enjoys the advantages of power. According to this theory elites have a social preponderance due to a kind of superiority (material, intellectual) (Martinelli 2009a, 2009b). V. Pareto describes ‘many elites’ that they follow each other in power (circulation of elites) (Pareto 1935). M. Weber theory is near ‘classical elite theory’ but also near ‘modern elite perspective’ and ‘democratic elitism’: “This portrayal-stressing power concentration in the state apparatus, legitimacy of rule, centrality of leadership groups, and the capacity of these groups to form cohesive power actors...” (Pakulski 2012: 38). R. Michels describes the importance of leaders’ elite in a political system and the leadership as an affair of a few individuals (iron law of oligarchy), (Michels 1911).

The structural-functional approach, introduced by Radcliffe-Brown (Erickson & Murpht 2002, Radcliffe-Brown 1940), influenced the power elite theory of F. Hunter. He examined elites on the small scale of a community and tried to investigate the webs and interconnections between clergy, political and economic power elites. He distinguished the obvious holders of power to the real holders. He introduced the notion of ‘power structure’. And he focused on how works the decision making
activities (Hunter 1953). G. W. Domhoff, much like Hunter, in his book “Who Rules America?” focused on local and national networks and access them in their decision making roles in order to take conclusions about the power structure of the country. He estimates that a high financial elite class, (e.g. banks, corporations), dominates the ‘power structure’ of the country, both in economic and political level (Domhoff 1967).

C. Wright Mills described into a social-conflict approach, the ‘social power’ as the interconnected interests of the leaders of the military, corporate, and political elements of society. And he describes as power elite a ‘quasi-hereditary caste’ which often profits from a qualified education and enters into predominant positions (Wright Mills 1956).

On the one hand, M. Gilens and B. I. Page, in their statistical analysis of policy issues, concluded that “Multivariate analysis indicates that economic elites and organized groups representing business interests have substantial independent impacts on U.S. government policy, while average citizens and mass-based interest groups have little or no independent influence. The results provide substantial support for theories of Economic-Elite Domination and for theories of Biased Pluralism, but not for theories of Majoritarian Electoral Democracy or Majoritarian Pluralism” (Gilens & Page 2014: 565). On the other hand, Marxist sociology rejects these theories as leading to an underestimation of the role of the masses and social classes. According to T. B. Botomore, social revolutions cannot be interpreted by the activities of small social groups, but by the action of entire social classes (Botomore 1993).

The Marxist theory of power was based on the role of force as the basis of ruling class domination. Gramsci identified two quite distinct forms of political control: domination, which was practiced by police and hegemony which referred to both ideological control and more crucially, consent. By hegemony, Gramsci meant the permeation throughout society of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs and morality that has the effect of supporting the status quo in power relations. Gramsci divided the superstructure into the public institutions such as the government, police, armed forces and the legal system he regarded as the state or political society and the non-coercive ones were the others, such as the churches, the schools, trade unions, political parties, cultural associations, clubs, the family etc. which he regarded as civil society. To some extent, schools could fit into both categories. Parts of school life are quite clearly coercive (compulsory education, the national curriculum, national standards and qualifications) whilst others are not (the hidden curriculum) (Bates 1975).

Finally, referring to methodological issues it has to be mentioned that historical interpretive research method (Cohen & Manion 1996) and content analysis of laws, decrees and proceedings were used to look into the ideological interaction of the bodies vested with power and education. The relevance to the statutory framework and the ideology of the education of the Principality of Samos bibliographical references are meager. The research focuses on the study of the primary file material (Cohen & Manion 1996, Mpagias 1998) and the sources which were used in the present study are mainly primarily on the effects of the princely power in the formation of the educational structures. Specifically, the most significant source of data collection for the research, constituted published and unpublished file material as for example: Imperial Fermania for the Principality of Samos, Laws and Principal decrees of the Principality of Samos, President Decrees of Provisional Government of Samos,

Specifically the periods are divided into sub-periods using as criteria how the individual character of the hegemonic power was formed. Consequently, this schedule follows the presentation of findings and focus on the predominant elite powers into the historical sub-periods of the Principality of Samos as follows: a) the period of the mighty Prince 1834-1849, with the preponderance of the Prince Steph. Vogoridis, who represented the Newly-phanariot elite (PGAS 1834-1849, PDSP 1836-1847, PSP 1842-1847, The Prince Decree of Samian Hegemony of 1837). b) The period of parliamentary and national regime 1850-1907, with the preponderance of the local haute bourgeoisie elite which controls the leading of the local political parties, the General Assembly of Samians and the Parliament (Laws of S.H. 1851-1907, Decrees of S.H. 1851-1907, PGAS 1849-1907, PSP 1849-1907) and c) the period of intense procedures of nationalization 1908-1912 (Laws of S.H. 1908-1912, Decrees of S.H. 1908-1912, PGAS 1908-1912, PSP 1908-1912). This subdivision: a) allows highlighting the forms of power relations developed in the Principality of Samos in each sub-period. b) Permits to record the effects of such relations in the formation of the institutional framework and the prevailing ideology of education in each sub-period. And c) decodes the process of transition from the education of the Principality to the Greek national education in the last periods.

Additionally, in our study structural-functional analysis (Terlexis 2001) was used to capture the dynamics of bodies vested with power and examine their influence on the educational institutional framework. The formation of the education of the Principality, based on the local statutory framework, permits intervention to: a) the Ecumenical Patriarchate (Files of Ecumenical Patriarchate 1831-1913, Varvounis 2005), b) the Greek state, c) the Ottoman empire, whereas, within the same framework, the Interventional role also is consolidated by a) the Prince, b) the Metropolitan and c) the local political parties of the Principality, which represent organized socioeconomic interests (Laws of S.H. 1851-1912, Decrees of S.H. 1837-1912, PGAS 1834-1912, PDSP 1836-1847, PSP 1842-1912, Ioannidis & Gaggos 1875, Svoronos 1903a, Svoronos 1903b).

2. The construction of elite powers in the context of the Samian Principality

The Principality, established in 1834 according to the Privileged Organization of Samos approved in 1832, was formed on this specific statutory framework, within which the powerful collective power of the Prince was developed. The Regime was ‘constitutional’ Domination with no clear separation between the three powers. And the right of voting was subjected to social and financial restrictions (Svoronos 1903a). The first Prince of Samos, Steph. Vogoridis, was proved also the longest serving Prince in the office, the entire period of 1834-1849, and his power presented the following characteristics: a) the center of power was re-located from Samos to Constantinople, since the Newly-phanariot Prince Steph. Vogoridis lived away from Samos. He visited the island once or twice (Lacroix 1853) and ruled with the assistance of nine governors (Ptnis n.d.), b) The Privileged Organization was violated due to the Prince's
prosecutions enforced to his opponents, due to his interventions in the choice of his officials who staffed the administrative mechanism, due to the presence of the Ottoman army, in the Principality, after his invitation and due to the repudiation of many foreigners (H.L.L. Hippocrates Lycurgus Logothetis 1849), c) The prince controlled the Parliament of Samians, choosing their own deputies by a larger number of candidates elected parliamentarians from the General Assembly. President of the Parliament was the Prince (PGAS 1834-1835, 1835-1840).

The period of the mighty Prince 1834-1849, concerning the governing of Prince Steph. Vogoridis, was marked by people’s riots (1835 and 1849) protesting against his overall rule (Vakirtzis 2005). The main protestors were the members of the ascending merchant-marine class (Sevastakis 1995, 1996, Vafeas 1998a, 1998b). The commercialization of the agricultural production, the development of marine and commerce and piracy also contributed to the development of the merchant-marine class (Laiou 2002). The economic liberalization (Burns n.d.) pervaded the General Assembly of Samians of 1849 (PGAS 1841-1849) an ideology which reached its peak after 1850.

The main characteristic of the historical framework of the period of parliamentary and national regime 1850-1907 was the enacting of the Organic Law of 1850 by which the distinction of the three powers became obvious. Since the Legislative power was exercised by the General Assembly by the Samian People and the Prince, who could, in emergency cases, issue legislative orders. The Administrative power was exercised by the Prince, the Parliament, the Municipalities and the officials of the Principality. Whereas, the judicial duties were exercised by the Parliament, the municipalities and the courts. The establishment of the ordinary courts and the organization of the management were the first result of the Organic Law (Svoronos 1903b). However, the most significant consequence of the establishments of the Organic Law of 1850 was the provision in the merchant-marine class of the right to elect and be elected, which led to the gathering of political and economic power in the hands of the civil class (Ioannidis & Gaggos 1875). The democratization of the representation system, with the election law of 1899, accelerated the procedure of urbanization, which led to the formation of an educated urban elite (Koukoulis 1910). This new elite with the Gymnasium (High School) as its center, was gathered and united in the political party which Themistoklis Sofoulis established in 1900 (Ptnis 1994). The political domination of the bourgeois class and the subsequent emancipation of the General Assembly of Samians, resulted in the restriction of the power of the Prince (Kavvadia 2003, Ptnis n.d.). The orientation of the two parties of Samos, the ‘Patriotic’ and ‘Progressive’ in the Athenian center was demonstrated by the ‘common’ conference of their heads Ioannis Hatzigiannis and Themistoklis Sofoulis in the Athenian newspaper ‘Acropolis’ at the turn of the 19th century to the 20th, in May 1899. The article writes that, the sixty years old, I. Hatzigiannis was called for many years ‘igemonofagos’, because of his crucial role in the rapid change of the Princes of Samos, from the Sublime Porte, due to his actions. The article also states that he frequently visited Athens (Christovasilis 1899).

The immediate consequences of this kind of political development were the changes in the financial field: the transition of the island into industrial capitalism, the gradual coming of an international market and the awakening of the national
consciousness of the islanders, with the contribution of the political parties and the bourgeoisie class of the island (Orfanou 2012).

The period of intense procedures of nationalization 1908-1912 is characterized by the revolts of 1908 in Turkey (Kitsikis 1998, Veremis 1977a) and of 1909 in Greece (Kitsikis 1998, Veremis 1977b). Both, expressed claims in powers by the bourgeois and were factors of a most intense national awakening. These revolts created a different framework and heralded a new era. The awakening of a new, highly educated elite and its growth in power is described also by the Samian election law of 1908 which defined the electorate “to have property of 10.000 grossia or University degree or to be officials in the Principality” (Law of Samian Hegemony 2034/3-7-1908, Nikolaidis 1995). However, the Principality of Samos was led steadily to the procedures of nationalization oriented to the Greece, the revolution of the newly-Turkish people had a negative impact on the Principality. On the 30th of July 1908, in the Principality a festive welcome was made to the representatives of the Ottoman Progressive and Unionist Committee (Nikolaidis 1995). A princely ‘coup’ was demonstrated which abolished the General Assembly and led to rebellion and the running away of Th. Sofoulis (Miller 1914). In 1911, the General Assembly was closed and in the elections, many Samian people were led to the ballot boxes by violence. Even the Turkish soldiers voted instead of citizens (Kekridis 2003). The violations of the Organic Law of 1850 continued and the Prince Andreas Kopasis circulated in 1909 in Samos ‘Nea Samos’, a newspaper of his political propaganda (Arslan 2004). After his assassination, in March 1912, he was succeeded by G. Vegleris, the last Prince of Samos (Loukatos 1977). During September of 1912 the Samian people with their leader Th. Sofoulis and assistants, many Cretans, Asian Minors, Macedonians and Ikarians, declared the revolution (Ptnis 1994). On the 11th of November 1912, the revolutionary committee declared the union with Greece (Vakirtzis 2005). The union was final on the 2nd of March 1913 when the Greek war ships reached the island (Miller 1914).

3. The imprinting of networks of elite powers in education

The operation of education in Samos in 1834-1850 was typically defined by the provisions of the Organic Privileged Provision of 1832. In the substance, however, was defined legislatively by the voting of the General Assemblies of the Samian People (PGAS 1834-1849) and the Prince decree of 1837 (PGAS 1835-1840: Στ΄ 1838). On the issue of the administration and the financial sources of education the Parliament is mainly implicated and secondly the Metropolitan, in an auxiliary and limited in responsibilities role, determined by the legislation of the Principality.

During this period, the fundamental education of Samos which prevailed, was the type of ‘monitorial’ schools. And in the secondary education the type of Hellenic School dominated. The spreading of education included a primary school in every community and four Greek schools, one for each one of the capitals of the four parts of the island. However, many were the problems in their functioning due to financial problems of the Principality, as the prince had collected all the public revenues of the island (Orfanou 2012).

During the period of parliamentary and national regime (1850-1907) the education is governed by the legislative framework which comprises the Organic Law of 1850.
According to this framework the Prince ‘supervised’ the arts and education. The sponsoring of schools and the payroll was conducted by the Principality and the Deputies were responsible for the management of the resources. The period of communitarianism and nationalism, was given the liberation of structures of growth in the political scene of the bourgeois class. The results of the said changes were the establishment of schools with practical vocational orientation, the turn towards the Greek models.

During the same period, we have transformations in the school types. According to the regulation of 1866 two three-class Boarding Schools (Port of Vathi, Neo Karlovasi) were changed into two, two-class Hellenic School and in 1874 in full three-class Hellenic Schools. According to the transformation of 1880, full six-class Primary Schools were created in four capitals of the departments with the unification of a four-year inter-teaching, with the two first classes of the Hellenic School. Moreover, the third class of the Hellenic School in Vathy was incorporated into the four-class, up to that time Gymnasium, whereas, some primary schools evolved into seven-class Urban Schools. During this period, a decision was made upon the sending of scholars in Athens in order to be educated in the co-teaching method. In the year 1886 the co-teaching and the training of teachers by the Principality was enacted.

After 1860, the on-site production of school books commenced. During this period, emphasis was given on pre-school, whereas Aristomenis Stergioglidis, the Gymnasium Principal and Supervisor of Education, fought for the establishment of kindergartens in 1896 in all parts of the island. In primary education, since 1854, the type of the inter-teaching schools dominated, whereas in secondary education, already since 1855, the Hellenic School of Vathi was organized as Pythagorean Gymnasium and in 1870s was recognized as equivalent to the Greek Gymnasiums. As far as the women’s education is concerned, in 1854 established the Girls School of Vathi and in 1861 three additional Girls School. Even more, within the frameworks of the vocational education, the establishment of the business vocational schools prevailed, both private and public.

The Private education in Samos was organized in 1898 by Law regarding the supervision of private schools in Samos. It included the Commercial Lyceum Alkiviadis Spyridis ‘Samos’ (1898) and the Business Lyceum of Zisimos Nikolaidis ‘Pythagoras’ (1900). Orthodox religious schools were: the Hieratic School of Malagari (1855) and the ‘Holy Teaching Establishment’ of the Union ‘Anatoli’ of Patmos, which in 1906 was transferred to Samos.

Catholic schools also existed there. Specifically, the Missionaries of ‘Société des Missions Africains de Lyon’ appeared in Samos in 1886, where they directed a Males’ School (1890-1930) and the Sisters of Saint Joseph de Lyon established in Samos a girls’ school. In 1859, the sending of teachers was requested by the Greek state.

The Assembly of 1885 acted for the invitation of an expert in the teaching of the ‘demotic’ language. By special law, a ‘Special Examination Council of Primary Education’ was appointed and Aristeidis Charokopos was invited from Athens, as an organizer. During this period the education in Samos presented an image of improvement and the students almost doubled from 1875 up to 1898. The impact of the ‘educational demoticism’ on the island, witnesses a parallel course with the one of the modern-Greek state. The ascent of the bourgeoisie class in Samos, in that period, creates the requirements for the union of the island with Greece (Laws of S.H. 1851-1907, Decrees
of S.H. 1851-1907, Orfanou 2012).

The period of intense procedures of nationalization 1908-1912 was a period decisive in shaping the character of Samian education. In 1910, the schools in Samos were under the supervision of the Administration. And the personnel appointed by the Prince and paid by the Public Fund. The schools of fundamental education were primary, by Urban Schools. Even in 1910 a Full Girls and a Kindergarten School were put in operation in the port of Vathy. Whereas, private education included the School of Home Economics of Maria Kairou. Apart the Pythagorean Gymnasium in the capital of the Principality, other secondary schools functioned as: the vocational Mavrogeneios School, the Holy Educational Establishment ‘ANATOLI’, a private Business Lyceum, and others. In the field of ideology, the increase of the influence of the national center led to the drawing of models and standards from Greece, accelerated the procedures of contestation against the power of the Prince and improved the gradual nationalization of the educational mechanisms. The Samian educational legislation was simulated to the one of the Greek state. An expression of this evolution is, for example, the abolishment of the compulsory teaching of the international language Esperanto (Laws of S.H. 1908-1912, Decrees of S.H. 1908-1912, Orfanou 2012).

4. Interpreting the relation between education and powers

It is beyond any doubt that during the period of the mighty prince Steph. Vogoridis 1834-1849, the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the Metropolitan have not the full responsibility of the education, as in the Greek Orthodox schools of the Ottoman Empire. In that sense the predominant elite power in the education of the Principality of Samos was the Newly-phanariot elite. A leading elite, strictly cooperated with the Ottoman Empire and the Ecumenical Patriarchate, which was represented by the Prince of Samos Steph. Vogoridis (Stamatopoulos 2003). The local elite powers were pushed aside until the General Assembly of Samian in Pyrgos. This expressed editorially the revolt of 1849, claiming the freedom of trade and the interests of the local commercial-marine bourgeoisie (PGAS 1841-1849). The dominance of this elite had a decisive impact on the authoritarian character of the administration of education, while the types of schools chosen were from the Ottoman standards of schools of ‘romaiikou millet’. The pressure of the rising middle classes to take part in the functions of education assumed the character of open conflict and accelerated the developments in society and the economy.

On the contrary, during the period of parliamentary and national regime (1850-1907), the leading elite was the ‘haute bourgeoisie’ of the Principality. Characteristic are the cases of the two leaders of the two main political parties of the Principality, I. Hatzigiannis and Th. Sofoulis, who are members of a high social-economical local bourgeoisie. The role of the Newly-phanariot elite, represented by the Prices, was supplanted by the local economic and political elite powers. The local political parties were linked mostly with the Greek State and less with the Ottoman Empire. The organization of the schools was alike to this of the Greek State Schools and was clearly distinguished by the school organization related with the Ecumenical Patriarchate and the local Metropolitan.

It is also argued that education is linked with the diffusion of the dominant ideology
of the bourgeoisie (Milios 1993). The kind of schools and content of knowledge in the Principality reflects the ‘ideology’ of a bourgeoisie class (establishment of schools with practical vocational orientation, business vocational schools prevailed) and the growing Greek nationalism. E.g. Greek nationalism as described in the history books printed in the official Princely Printing of Samos island since 1900 and prepare the integration of the island in the ‘national body’ of Greece (Gialamas & Iliadou-Tachou et al. 2014).

However, during the period of intense procedures of nationalization (1908-1912) two main elite powers are emerging. A new local bourgeois class, based on the ‘educational level’ and not the social-economical origins of its members, as is described previously (Law of Samian Hegemony 2034/3-7-1908, Nikolaidis 1995). And secondly, a Prince, approved by the New-Turks, who with a princely ‘coup’ abolished the General Assembly, led to rebellion and the running away of his opponents, as Th. Sofoulis, the main representative of the Samian local parliamentary (Vakirtzis 2005, Ptinis 1994). In this period the education remains near the Greek and western models (textbooks, curriculum, and organization of studies). However, the compulsory teaching of Esperanto (Laws of S.H. 1908-1912, Decrees of S.H. 1908-1912), tried to give a sense of cosmopolitanism versus the nationalism. The assassination of the Prince restores the leadership of the local haute bourgeoisie, as represented by Themistocles Sofoulis, as the main elite power (Vakirtzis 2005, Ptinis 1994).

5. Discussion: The ‘typological’ classification of Samos’s model

Within the frameworks which was formed by the Sublime Porte and the Great Forces, the Samian Principality developed a unique regime of education which, by 1850, was defined more by the decisions of the General Assemblies of the Samian People and the social-financial developments, which brought new forces in the political scenery of the island and less from the traditional centers, such as Sublime Porte or the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The education of the island, affiliated to the authoritarian character of the Principal Power, exploited the Organic Law since 1850 and afterwards, returned in the emerging bourgeoisie layers to undertake educational initiatives at the beginning and formulate afterwards the character and its structure. The increased effect of the Greek state contributed to the specific laws and was imposed on the education. At the end of the period, the decrease of the influence of the Prince, in combination with the transformation of the social power of the parties in a political-Interventional role, contributed, not only to the increase of their power, but also to the acceleration of the nationalization procedures by the changes of types, grades, language etc., which occurred in the Greek state and were influenced by currents, which were growing in this period such as educational demoticism. In the last said period and a while before the integration of Samos in the Greek state, the ideology and philosophy of the education was defined by the nationalism, dominant in this period. Consequently the elite-powers in Samian Principality responded to the structural-functional approach, introduced by Radcliffe-Brown (Erickson & Murpht 2002, Radcliffe-Brown 1940), and influenced by the power elite theory of F. Hunter. Samian elites were developed inside the Samian community and their structure was determined by the interconnections between clergy, political and economic developments as they were influenced by the international evolution process. Within this context, the establishment of ‘hegemony’
consisting of the bourgeoisie’s intelligentsia, which had been graduated from the schools of Samian Hegemony, had serious consequences: this ‘hegemony’ contributed to the ideological control of the population and accelerated either the process of national identity’s configuration or the process of national homogenization.
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