

**Re/collecting Greek America:
Reflections on Ethnic Struggle, Success, and Survival**

Yiorgos Anagnostou

Any re/collecting of early Asian America, then, must be a revisionist project, addressing the conspicuous absence of Asian Americans in “official histories” and correcting stereotypes, myths, and false assumptions. This historical reconstruction necessarily carries with it political and social consequences that can substantively change the lives of individuals and communities.

- Josephine Lee, Imogene L. Lim, Yuko Matsukawa

The concept of re/collection has a twofold meaning, capturing not only remembering but also revisiting an archive to remember anew. Re/collection animates rediscovery and recovery. It brings into focus what earlier collecting has intentionally or unintentionally overlooked or marginalized. In this dual capacity, re/collection forestalls forgetting and expands the range and scope of remembering. It enables knowing differently.

The notion of history as re/collection is linked with the notion of history as cultural practice; the former illuminates the latter. Historians recognize that the making of history is not a disinterested enterprise divorced from cultural assumptions and ideas. This is the reason why at any one time, society may privilege the telling of some pasts and the sidelining of others. Because certain voices are excluded, remembering is punctuated by absences. Thus critical historiography asks: Who produces history? How and for what purpose? What pasts does a society remember and why? This approach explains the silences in the historical record and reflects on the consequences of forgetting. In turn, reflexivity probes re/collection to produce new pasts. Re/collection is an integral component of history as cultural practice.¹ Together, these two interrelated ideas guide this essay.

To relate the idea of history as cultural practice to ethnic historiography, consider the American/immigrant narrative of success, which defines achievement in terms of money, status, career, entrepreneurship, and assimilation. It does not define success in terms of an immigrant's worth as a person nor his or her ability to build intercultural bridges; it does not consider an immigrant's creative negotiations with bicultural belonging or selective ethnic reproduction. In the case of Greek America, for instance, the divergent cultural positioning of male and female immigrants points out that success as socioeconomic achievement refers to men and success as civic and cultural achievement refers to women.² Why does this narrative privilege socioeconomic status? And why does it present it as ethnic when the narrative essentially speaks to a gender-specific (male) experience?

Critical scholarship endeavors to examine, as I pointed out, the implications of this social construction. Immigrant success as socioeconomic status legitimizes the American Dream. The mobility of newcomers asserts the inclusiveness of the nation. Demonstrating the gender inflection in this story of success would identify this story's displacements. The framing of male history as ethnic renders invisible women's alternative struggles and successes, and thus masks different visions of becoming an American ethnic. The practice of reflexivity in history illuminates presences and absences in a collection of evidence and helps us think about their respective ramifications.

It is apt to explore the notion of historical re/collection with *Greek Americans: Struggle and Success*, a popular ethnic history that commands high academic and public visibility. Its first two editions, published in 1980 and 1988, respectively, by distinguished military sociologist Charles C. Moskos (1934–2008), enjoy canonical status. It is considered a classic. The book has been praised by accomplished professional historians and endorsed by civic leaders and eminent politicians. It has even served as the primary historical reference in graduate work.³ Popular magazines acclaim it and readers praise it. It is regularly and positively reviewed in the media, embraced by teachers, taught in Greek American courses, and prominently displayed in U.S. Greek festivals. It is presented in community cultural functions. Often the lone "ethnic" text adorning the library shelves of Greek American homes, this is a text that in short is "by far the most widely read history of the Greeks in America."⁴ If one adds its readability and popularizing angle, *Greek Americans* is indeed an "official" history positioned to shape public understanding

of this ethnicity's experience and identity. Given that historical knowledge not only concerns the past but also the ways in which this knowledge shapes public consciousness in the present, it is essential to carefully evaluate how this ethnic history collects Greek America and recognize the implications of its particular telling in contemporary conversations about identity.

While *Greek Americans* enjoys distinction in certain interpretive communities, it stirs controversy in others. Reviewers have taken this history to task for inadequately collecting the role of women in the social reproduction of ethnicity; for minimizing the extent of the immigrant working class and the impact of leftist activism; for lacking an explicit theoretical angle; for deploying too narrow a definition of the diaspora; and at times sacrificing analysis for impression and anecdote.⁵ Given this reception, the third edition of *Greek Americans*, by sociologist Peter C. Moskos, inevitably enters a challenging terrain. This is an expanded and revised version. I looked forward to reading it particularly for its updates: I was curious about its position in ongoing debates such as the racialization of immigrants from southeastern Europe, and wondered what re/collections and revisions it may have undertaken to retell ethnicity.

To begin, this edition contributes to our understanding of the internal diversity of Greek America at the macro level of population statistics. Demographic figures of Greek Orthodox membership and church attendance, for instance, point to shifting boundaries of affiliation. "Of the more than 1.2 million Americans who claim Greek ancestry," the author observes, "fewer than half are adherents of the church, and less than 10 percent are regular attendees" (104). Greek America further emerges as internally fragmented and in flux, undergoing further "differentiation and dissension" (139), a development already noted in the second edition. Heterogeneity is established empirically. If there is still a norm in Greek America, the authors conclude, it is one of "full diversity of class and social positions" (177).

This recognition leads to a fundamental revision. If the earlier edition predicted the gradual erosion of secular ethnicity and the concomitant ascendancy of sacred identity, the new collection corrects this projection: "Although the church is still prominent in Greek American life," Peter Moskos writes, "the era of the church as the defining element of the Greek American community may have ended" (105). In fact, a reversal may be taking place, with the "future of a sacred Greek American ethnicity" now becoming "far more questionable" (106). The appeal of secular ethnicity reconfigures identity boundaries and makes it impossible to hold on to the

notion of “one Greek America” (175), of U.S. Greek ethnicity as equivalent to Greek Orthodoxy. If the church has been crucial in ethnic reproduction, this new landscape poignantly raises the importance of re/collecting the role of secular institutions in Greek American cultural dissemination.⁶

The analysis of the latest U.S. Census figures leads to an important collection of evidence: a 20 percent increase in the Greek American population between 1980 and 2000, and a further 11 percent growth between 2000 and 2010 (191). How does one explain this development given the low fertility rate of Greek Americans and low levels of immigration from Greece? The author proposes intermarriage as the “most likely explanation” (193), with the “non-Greek” spouse being drawn to Greek ethnicity. This conclusion adds yet another layer in understanding the significance of this ethnicity on a national scale. It is not merely that Greek America lacks social stigma. It is also embraced by “non-Greeks” and individuals of mixed ancestries. In interethnic marriages and among bicultural children, Greek ethnicity works “as a sort of ‘trump’ identity in which Greek plus non-Greek equals Greek” (193). The competition over cultural affiliation benefits those ethnicities, like Greek or Italian, that has established themselves as most desirable in the American multicultural agora.

Greek Americans is simultaneously a challenging and convenient book to review. Because it neglects to collect essential scholarship it makes itself vulnerable to criticism. It leaves out, for instance, a wide range of post-1990 research on identity, immigration, women, interethnic marriage, sexualities, and ethnic survival. It displays no interest in dialoguing with current work on whiteness, symbolic ethnicity, and transnational studies. If historical understanding develops via debate and reassessment, this history proceeds independently from major developments in the historiography of ethnicity. Notably absent, for example, is latest research on the etiology of European American socioeconomic mobility, a topic obviously central to *Greek Americans*. While the book does take into account a key re/collection, the debate over the scope and impact of the Greek American left, it refrains from probing recent developments in Greek America’s labor activism. There is also the author’s tendency to offer opinion and fleeting, albeit strong, commentary on films, popular texts, and scholarship, a practice that will puzzle academics.

But *Greek Americans* is a hybrid text, a meshing of professional and popular history that creates both a challenge and an opportunity for an academic reviewer. There is the concern over the viability of establishing the ground for a meaningful debate. Is it possible to establish a productive dialogue with a work that shows no inclination to substantively engage with current scholarship on the topic? My essay brings forth the text's ideological undercurrents when *Greek Americans*' empirical rhetoric denies their presence in the text.

Although *Greek Americans* may contain some oversights, the third edition does consider the matter of re/collection. Following Charles Moskos's steps, the author desires greater visibility for an enduring research tradition, namely non-university-affiliated researchers devoted to Greek American studies. The tireless labor and long-lasting contributions of Steve Frangos, Dan Georgakas, the late Helen Papanikolas, and Elaine Thomopoulos, among others, deserve anthologies and analysis—all-in-all greater visibility. Memoirs and family biographies represent a vital output that also merits scholarly attention and institutional collection. The same applies for a host of narrative and performative genres, including stand-up comedy and poetry. Moskos notes that "Greek American literature had grown to the point where it could be the subject of its own interpretive school" (163). Indeed. And while women's voices still remain marginal in this edition, the prominence given to Theano Papazoglou Margaris (1906–1991), an author, actor, and political activist, is a reminder that her life and work warrant a book-length manuscript.

Yet like the earlier editions, the third edition of *Greek Americans* is notable for offering useful collections of archival and textual material for convenient reference. It collects the recent output of periodicals, newspapers, and magazines. It features a new section, "Greek Americans on Screen." It also offers ethnographic vignettes of interethnic conflict and laborers' experiences—the clash between the Irish and Greek workers in Lowell, Massachusetts, for instance—that underscore the necessity for a range of re/collection work. Thus this edition implicitly underlines the limits of "the single-group approach" in ethnic historiography and the research potential of cross-cultural encounters.⁷ In addition, the extended narrative of a bridge worker recounting his family's occupational experience serves as reminder, if one is needed, of the significance of oral histories to recover voices neglected or maligned by official history. The stories of waiters, students, laborers, actors, artists, women, same-sex union advocates, and

activists for social justice, among others, call for re/collection to widen the scope of ethnic history in the interest of an inclusive people's history.

The attentive reader will notice that dispersed throughout *Greek Americans* are statements, reflections, remarks, anecdotes, observations, assumptions, and evidence that offer important insights, but also complicate, even contradict, several lines of argumentation within the book. Several of these insights and contradictions are found readily, at the center of the text. Others yield to scrutiny reluctantly, as they reside in the margins. To honor the legacy of Charles Moskos's openness to debate and historical revisionism, I opt for this question as my compass: How can reflexivity and critique help us advance, instead of stall, Greek American studies?⁸ I argue it is necessary to re/collect Greek America in alternative frameworks than those utilized in *Greek Americans*. I show that several potential reframing elements are already present in this edition, albeit marginalized or neglected in its main interpretive plotting. In the spirit of the preface, I write this essay from a revisionist angle, making the case for new re/collection projects.

Re/collecting the Transnational

The first editions of *Greek Americans* asked: What analytical framework might help best narrate the Greek American experience—the “American ethnics” or the “Hellenic diaspora” model? The former “maintains that the history of Greeks in America has been shaped decisively by adaptation to the demands of ... America's economic and social structure.” The latter defines Greek Americans as transplanted Greeks, “part of a homeland extension, an *homogenia*, an Hellenic diaspora” (144). “Which of these—to be sure overstated—versions are we to accept?” Charles Moskos asked. “There is no simple answer, for each contains part of the truth.”⁹

Moskos rightly insisted that scholars examine Greek America in the context of American society. He also defined ethnicity as a process of transformation, of remaking and reinventing. This position confronted the purist ideology of “true Greekness,” and, by extension, the hierarchical ranking of global Greek identities. A decisive rebuttal, certainly, to those who dismiss Greek Americans as adulterated Greeks. The authors empower U.S. Greek ethnicity, seeing it as a legitimate affiliation in its own right, not a lesser version of a supposedly authentic,

Greece-based identity; recasting it, as he should, as a process of becoming, not “a narrative of loss” (2014:179).”¹⁰

It was equally valid to claim that the diaspora model—the view of U.S. Greeks as transplanted Greeks—is incapable of possibly taking into account the multiple ways in which America intersects with and draws into its orbit Greek American lives. Still, as I have argued in detail elsewhere, the duality was built on too narrow a definition of the diaspora.¹¹ Once we move beyond the definition of diaspora as an extension of the homeland—that is, an archipelago of little Greeces that organically connect with Greece as its political, social, and emotional center—we are then bound to take notice of an empirical reality in which populations within Greek America continue to cultivate affective, professional, cultural, and material connections with Greece while they participate in, shape, and are being shaped by American society. This phenomenon requires the re/collecting of Greek America beyond the American ethnics/ Hellenic diaspora polarity.

Life narratives may challenge tidy categories, as lived experience may nuance conventional classifications. This is why I re/collect a particular reminiscence by the author, to show that there has been all along a third alternative model of affiliation. *Greek Americans* follows the second edition’s interest in personal and family biography to offers its own, this time Peter Moskos’s memoir on becoming Greek American. A particular episode about father and son visiting their ancestral homeland in southern Albania together is instructive. The passage lovingly recalls a zestful Charles Moskos cherishing social time with his kin. Readers learn that he maintained affective ties with this extended family throughout his life; he also kept providing financial support to them. A connection with family in the ancestral region nourished and motivated Charles Moskos. In other words, an attachment beyond the nation animated his life.

Active in American political, social, and institutional life as a sociologist and U.S. government consultant; involved with the academic, social, and cultural affairs of Greek America; and sustaining emotional, social, and economic bonds with kin networks across national borders, Charles Moskos’s nexus of national and ethnic affiliations included a *diaspora* component—once one defines diaspora not as transplanted Greekness or primary loyalty to the ancestral homeland but rather as a web of affiliations that connect an individual with places of emigration.¹² Peter Moskos’s memoir concurs with this re/collection. It recognizes that the

(re)making of U.S. Greek identity is a function of experiences both within and beyond the nation. His confessional narrative sketches out a dramatic personal transformation, a departure from the initial lack of interest in—even rejection of—his childhood immigrant Greek world (the “church and old people speaking Greek” [211]). Peter Moskos eventually acquired an appreciation for Greek heritage: taking courses in a U.S. Greek Program awakened in him an interest “in Greek and Greek American culture.” Additionally, a study abroad trip to Greece sponsored by that program led him “to recognize and appreciate [his] Greekness”: “I feel more Greek *and* American than Greek American,” he admits (211). A transnational configuration—an American institution hosting a Modern Greek program and linking American and heritage students with educational and cultural organizations in Greece—makes possible a cultural reappraisal and a reinvented identity. In what ways did Greek learning and experience contribute to this ethnic reclamation? What does it mean to be “more Greek *and* American?” The author of this new edition elects not to probe further. Readers may long to know more, as this example promises insights into the process of identity making and the role of U.S. Modern Greek programs in it.

This is not an isolated example of transnational affiliation. My second- and third-generation students at The Ohio State University for instance were born mostly in the American Midwest, and they lead culturally multifaceted lives within and across national borders. They may be listening to Dr. Bouzouki, Petrelis, Mitropanos, Drake, or Beyonce. They may be cheering for the Ohio State Buckeyes on Saturday and Olympiakos on Sunday. They may be dancing to the *macarena*, *ikariotiko*, reggae, techno, or Greek hip-hop. Certainly not transplanted Greeks by any stretch of the imagination, and definitively participants in American society, they cultivate connections with Greece via study abroad programs, family visits, or even social media and the internet. Clearly, neither the nation-centric American ethnics model nor the Hellenic diaspora model can adequately map this web of multiple affiliations. Their experience could be fruitfully examined via a “binational or transnational” framework.¹³

At work in Greek America then is the interplay of national, ethnic, and diaspora connections, a vastly complex network that escapes containment within any national border; it cannot be adequately grasped by nation-centric historiography. Greek America is neither solely American nor solely Greek. It is neither a history that begins and ends in the United States, nor is it a history with Greece at its center. One alternative way to conceptualize it, as I have explained

elsewhere, is within the transnational plane United States/Greek worlds elsewhere model.¹⁴ The crossings, flows, and linkages, as well as multiple sites of identification within this field, call for expanding the terrain of historical and cultural collection and re/collection beyond the “tyranny of the national in the writing of history.”¹⁵

Ethnic Success

This new edition of *Greek Americans* questions the organization of the original text around the question of success. It no longer treats its topic as a transparent category, registering a measure of unease over the association of success with socioeconomic mobility. It pauses to reflect: “Any listing of Greek American success stories runs the risk of ethnic boasting, a kind of defensive triumphalism indicating an underlying psychic insecurity” (145). The discussion acknowledges problematic facets in speaking about ethnicity as status. Isn’t it “slightly self-denigrating,” since it “assumes that non-Greek American opinion has the right to pass judgment as to whether or not Greeks really merit acceptance and respect” (146)? This opens a fertile yet unexplored terrain of re/collection: to examine ethnicity as a function of dominant discourses, or ethnicity in relation to the nation’s power to constitute narratives of difference.¹⁶

This edition’s answer is to complicate the normalization of success. It does so by collecting several examples of individual and collective failure, including racism, interethnic exploitation, and the vocal support by many Greek Americans of the Greek junta (1967–1974). There are traces of women’s voices indicting patriarchy, although its systematic critique is missing. Some would add historical amnesia, others language loss. Public memory of ethnicity’s failings buffers the idealizations of a “model ethnicity.” It introduces a measure of cultural autonomy and contributes to critical self-assessment.

Greek America undoubtedly realizes socioeconomic distinction as upward mobility, an experience often cited as its defining attribute. It is this fulfillment of America’s promise to immigrants and their descendants that the book celebrates. How can attaining the glow of the American Dream from humble origins be explained? *Greek Americans* pursues the answers along several economic, psychological, and cultural trajectories: (a) an individualistic “entrepreneurial spirit,” and the value of economic independence, rooted in the pre-American exposure to free market economy at the turn of the twentieth century in Greece; (b) innovation,

bold and risky; (c) self-sacrificing hard work and frugality; and (d) the “will to achieve” (142). Immigrants then enact a cultural baggage that is posited as the major drive for success. This “transplanted cultural endowment” has been utilized to explain the differential mobility of Greek and Italian immigrants in the Boston area, giving further credence to the culture-centered model of mobility.¹⁷

A paradigm shift in the historiography of European Americans re/collects immigrant and ethnic adaptations in relation to the nation’s racial structure. A corpus of eminent scholarship examines the constitutive role of racial hierarchies in the Americanization and mobility of southeastern European immigrants and their descendants. It traces the tumultuous transformation of these populations, punctuated by the dominant society’s explicit and implicit violence, from despised inferior people to eventually respectable “white ethnics.” Though initially classified as outside “proper whiteness” and subjected to exclusion and nativist violence, induction into whiteness provided a major advantage in the competition for jobs, social acceptance, and status. From union membership to integration into white social, professional, and economic spaces; from assimilation into mainstream institutions to the benefits of the GI Bill; and from post–World War II urban renewal, redlining, and state-dispensation of college education and home ownership loans, the differential mobility of European Americans vis-à-vis African Americans cannot be understood independently from the institutional and informal racism that haunted African Americans in a most immense scale. Southeastern European incorporation was surely uneven, differential, and cumbersome, but this exclusion pales in comparison to the enormity of violence inflicted upon people of color. The two are incomparable.¹⁸

Although a solid record of numerous cases certainly shows U.S. Greeks extending solidarity to African Americans, and although historians document the activism of artists and authors, the working class, businessmen, institutions, clergy, and even communities, who openly spoke up and acted upon their commitment to America’s ideal of racial justice, this opposition to the racial status quo remained localized and did not translate into collective mobilization during the Civil Rights era. As *Greek Americans* ruefully takes note, Archbishop Iakovos’s public support of the Civil Rights movement was “far more progressive than the majority of his flock” (95). The fact remains that on the structural level, European Americans quietly—and in several cases not so tacitly—acquiesced to racial hierarchies, and in doing so they collectively reaped the

benefits of whiteness. Roger Waldinger puts it in this manner: “in becoming white, the immigrants and their descendants also became party to strategies of social closure that maintained black exclusion and ensured more stable employment and better wages for others of their own.”¹⁹ Ethnic success cannot be divorced from the social drama of European American consent to racial domination.

But *Greek Americans* leaves out the topic of white privilege as an additional causal variable to ethnic success. Therefore, the reader will recognize a fundamental irony in its methodology. While this history advocates the analysis of ethnicity in relation to the American social structure, it elides this requirement when it comes to immigrant and ethnic acquiescence to Jim Crow and its informal manifestations in the American North. A historical compromise that contributed to their safety, to be sure, this consent also played a role in the scale and rate of their socioeconomic mobility.

Part of a scholar’s civic responsibility is to probe dark chapters in U.S. history and make this knowledge public. Understanding this past, no matter how painful, annoying, or uncomfortable, may enable interracial understanding. History possesses the power to shape contemporary identity, the ways one sees the Self and the Other—the way one acts upon the world. This is the reason why history as cultural practice examines historical knowledge in relation to the wider sociopolitical field within which it circulates, including the popular uses of the past in the present.²⁰ An ethnic history that takes race seriously is positioned to explain the root causes of racial animosities. How else to oppose the tendency among European Americans, still alive in public life, to view black people as anti-neighbors? *Greek Americans* boldly makes this collection public: “An almost endemic fear among Greek Americans was, and to some extent still is, the encroachment of the *mavri*—the blacks” (188).

Racial domination, after all, operates via explicit and implicit forms of power. The narrative of self-propelled ethnic success, widely embraced by Greek Americans, constitutes an informal yet deeply political “folk etiology,” contributing to that domination. This narrative—the bootstraps model of achievement—draws a wedge between European Americans and African Americans in the volatile national debate about inequality divided along racial lines. Once success is collected solely as a function of culture and psychology—(male) entrepreneurial acumen, hard work, discipline, deference of gratification, risk, self-reliance, and the craving for

achievement—it hides the competitive advantage of white privilege conferred upon European Americans. In this manner it regularly feeds erroneous conclusions with far-reaching repercussions.

Take the “immigrant analogy” as a case in point. If Polish Americans, Italian Americans, and Greek Americans have succeeded, this reasoning maintains, there should be no reason that in a liberal democracy other groups, most notably African Americans, could not also succeed; unless, of course, it is they are to be blamed. What else can possibly explain their high levels of poverty if not pathologies in their own culture? This politically inflected discourse never tires to reiterate that African Americans’ lack of comparative mobility is their own cultural failing. In counter distinction, the European American is celebrated as an icon of national inclusiveness, indeed as “the exemplary American citizen”: a self-sufficient figure whose toil and determination were the key to overcoming poverty and discrimination to eventually realize the American Dream. Disregarding institutionalized exclusion, and the disproportionate scale of racist violence inflicted upon African Americans, the culturalist explanation of ethnic mobility is complicit in reproducing this misplaced analogy, feeding interracial estrangement.²¹

Symbolic Ethnicity and Identity as Choice

Does symbolic ethnicity do justice to the cultural realities of European Americans? For readers unfamiliar with symbolic ethnicity, this paradigm theorizes third- and fourth-generation, middle-class European American identities as (a) a matter of individual style and creative self-fashioning; (b) a surface, thinly felt concept, easily expressed through symbols; (c) a matter of personal choice, conveniently elected to fulfill an individual’s social and psychological needs; and (d) a private construction—through media, travel, playful appropriation of ethnic markers— independent of ethnicity’s social structure.²²

Greek Americans collects Greek America as symbolic ethnicity, though it makes no reference to the debate surrounding it. An analysis of its usage of the term reveals a somewhat idiosyncratic application, as the evidence it provides refutes some of the paradigm’s tenets I identified above. A brief commentary on comedian Basile, an Ohio-born, bilingual comedian, offers a cue; his Greek identity is portrayed as symbolic, “optional and yet very strong” (197). He varies his stand-up comedy between “Greek and non-Greek” shows, depending on the target

audience. His identity certainly entails situational performance, as the scholarship of “ethnic options” instructs, but it is also portrayed as enduring. An identity is rendered symbolic because it entails context-specific choice, though its portrayal as deep challenges conventional uses of symbolic ethnicity as surface identity.

To claim that Greek American identity has become primarily symbolic is also to say that social structure—namely, socialization in family, membership in community organizations, and experience such as dance, language, and culture instruction, as well as filial affect—plays no *constitutive* role in the making of identity. Significantly, *Greek Americans* recognizes this function of the social: “For the grandchildren of the immigrants, Greek ethnicity is both a form of *cultural transmission* and a voluntary affirmation of Greek American identity” (181). Regarding “the presence of *deep* [intergenerational, second and third] *continuities*,” Moskos writes: “But in their *deepest* inclinations of conduct, religious approach, social bias, feelings for family, and affection for the old country, there are *heavy signs of immigrant shaping*” (185, emphasis mine). In addition, “Although one might recognize ethnic differences between, say, a Greek American raised in Lowell, Massachusetts, and one raised in Orange County, California, the more salient observation might be how *interchangeable* the two would probably be in their social background and *outlook*” (176, emphasis mine).

These passages recognize Greek American identities as embedded in social structure, within which they are mediated, even partially determined. The popularity of Greek folk dances among Greek American youth, to cite just one example, is not independent from the youth’s habitual socialization into its practice. It involves more than symbols, more than nostalgic evocation of immigrant culture, more than mere choice. Shedding this kind of pleasurable habitus is not always a matter of readily disposable preference. Thus U.S. Greek ethnicity is neither superficial in its cultural affiliations nor independent from social structure, as symbolic ethnicity maintains. Indeed, as Moskos notes, understanding “the creation of an ethnic identity” is to account for both socialization into ethnicity as well as the “appearance of new forms of ethnic consciousness” (181).²³

This idea of identity as choice is central to symbolic ethnicity and requires careful navigation. Symbolic ethnicity, of course, is part of a larger sociological thinking of ethnicity as voluntary affiliation. Identity materializes through an individual’s conscious cultural

identification (or dis-identification), not an unreflective acceptance of the individual's ethnic (i.e., biological) ancestry. According to this view, one could discard her ethnicity, reinvent it, or manipulate it situationally. The view of identity as choice departs from the conventional view of ethnicity as descent to instead embrace identity as consent. Identity is no longer seen as a matter of conforming to an ancestral culture, of reproducing imposed ethnic traditions. Instead, it entails an open-ended process in which individuals exercise agency to shape their own unique identities. Subjects are seen as "mature free agents" becoming "architects of [their own] fates."²⁴ Social and psychic constraints may be acknowledged though social determinations are marginalized, albeit often ignored.

Given that "non-Greek" spouses opt for the trump Greek identity, and assimilated Greek Americans often understand their ethnic identity in terms of choice, *Greek Americans* employs choice as an analytical tool to explain identity making. After all, Peter Moskos's own experience inevitably underlines a person's capacity to disengage from given ethnic practices and reengage meaningfully with a new re/collection. Unfulfilled with the immediate Greek environment of his youth, as I have pointed out, he distanced himself from it, only to eventually discover alternative aspects of heritage, and reinvent ethnic identity anew. His sense of agency must have been felt powerfully, leading to his view of Greek America as symbolic ethnicity. "For me and many Greek Americans," he writes, "Greek American culture is something we choose to adopt, a symbolic ethnicity" (215).

Choice is a culturally powerful idiom that encapsulates core American ideals: an individual's unique identity, the right to self-determination, independence, and freedom. An individual's conscious agency, glossed as choice, option, or voluntary identity, is of course an integral component of identity making. Individuals act upon ethnicity to disavow it rationally, refashion it creatively, parody it playfully, perform it situationally, and hide it or acknowledge it selectively. Individuals may rebel against or simply feel alienation from, and in turn reject, nonresonant ethnic practices, or they may rationally assess them as a liability or an asset in their lives. The sociology of European American ethnicities has effectively probed this terrain.

However, it is erroneous to treat individual agency separately from social determinations. From this vantage point, choice cannot possibly serve as the departure point for analysis since such a methodology erroneously assumes "the individual as given and not as a constructed

category.”²⁵ Sociology offers powerful theoretical tools—habitus, structuration, subjectification—to grapple with the vastly complex interplay of agency, social structure, and discourse. The demanding task is to explain why an individual finds certain practices (marked as ethnic) compelling or, alternatively, estranging. The following narrative that a “non-Greek wife” shared with me underlines the analytical limits and limitations of a choice-centered social analysis: “And I felt deeply connected with the music of Manos Hadjidakis and it touched me deeply, and it was something that it spoke to me; and I could not resist listening to it and that was puzzling to me; I could not explain its power over me.” Identification is a matter of deep psychic and cultural processes often beyond an individual’s rational control. It requires deciphering, both for the subject who experiences it and the cultural analyst who approaches the self as a culturally constructed category. To return to the example of the comedian Basile: analysis must attend to the situational performance of identity but also probe further to examine how this person’s ethnic identity was produced in the context of his biography. Does Basile feel that he has a choice *not* to perform his ethnicity? The analytical task is to elucidate identity as social construction, a vital requirement, it goes without saying, when it comes to proposing authoritative strategies for ethnic survival. Our inability at the moment to adequately discuss these matters sorely underlines the need for re/collecting identity construction and enhancing the collection of sophisticated ethnographies of subjectivity among the second, third, and fourth generations and beyond.²⁶

Ethnic Survival

This edition of *Greek Americans* engages the question of the future of Greek America. It asks what steps Greek Americans should take to sustain identity well into the twenty-first century, raising issues of cultural politics and policy. Because the proposed solution is predicated on the notion of ethnicity as choice, the discussion skirts around the immigrant and second-generation demographic, whose ethnic identities are more likely to be embedded within conventional venues of socialization, namely family, community, ethnic organizations, and links with Greece. These key mechanisms for ethnic reproduction are beyond the optimal strategies this volume proposes for ethnic survival.

Rather, the question is discussed in relation to those individuals and cohorts who find themselves removed—culturally, emotionally, or intellectually—from ethnicity’s social structure: the incoming non-Greek spouse, the potential philhellene, the third and fourth

generation, the highly assimilated Greek American whose social life takes place at a remove from, or only tangentially to, ethnicity. The preoccupation is with making Greek identity available as an appealing choice to these populations. How to best place Greek in a society where assimilation calls for ethnicity's surrender and multiculturalism for ethnicity's reclaiming? How does one ultimately counter the specter of what is seen as an "unremitting and seemingly irreversible erosion of Greekness in America"?²⁷

The proposed survival strategy is based on a straightforward rationale: if U.S. Greek identity is a matter of choice, if the continuation of ethnic identity depends on its capacity to generate pride, if current nationwide representations of Greekness effectively appeal to non-Greeks, as the evidence for trump identity reveals, then it is a matter of common sense to keep collecting ethnicity along venues that already contribute to its desirability. What are these routes? The specific solution is highlighted in the book's closing statement: "As long as Greek Americans represent the best of the American ideal—the *filotimo* of basic honesty, decency, and a hospitable nature (and delicious food doesn't hurt)—Greek America will continue to thrive" (216). A cultural value offers the core principle for organizing a narrative of identity preservation.²⁸

Let us take note that Moskos's proposition dissolves the boundaries between the national and the ethnic, as the obvious rendering of *filotimo* as an American ideal indicates. "Greek" and "American" become interchangeable. Ethnicity's survival hinges upon the conflation of national with ethnic values, a position evident in the author's reading of the film *My Big Fat Greek Wedding*:

The elements that have so defined the Greek American for almost a century—family, hard work, entrepreneurship, food, and religion—represent, to many, an idealized set of traditional American values. Despite the insecurities inherent to any ethnic minority, *My Big Fat Greek Wedding* not only affirmed Greek American values but embraced them as quintessentially American. (200)

The film then offers a paradigmatic example of once again collecting Greek *and* American as sameness. Ethnicity safeguards *national* core values to resolve contemporary anxieties and revitalize the nation, now under threat by secularization and modernization. American audiences envy ethnicity, as national life confronts the angst of "unloving parents, sibling rivalry, weak family ties, bad food, and an overall sense of aimlessness" (200). Greek

immigrants and Greek Americans were Americans all along, this reading of the film is inviting us to believe; the immigrant past and the Greek American present offer the promise of redeeming America. Sanitized and reified ethnicity comes to the moral rescue of the nation.

But one may ask: What ethnic element precisely is quintessentially American in the film? The answer is not clear. If the reference is to a socially conservative America, it is certainly not to the American creed of an individual's right in the pursuit of happiness. What American audience will identify with the oppressive Greek patriarch who denies the option of education to his daughter, a fundamentally non-American pedagogy?²⁹ While *Greek Americans* envisages ethnicity partaking in a common, overlapping national culture, it is not clear at all what the national stands for; is it the mainstream, the silent majority, or the very conservative minority within the "conservative majority"? If fully partaking into America is consent into national ideology, what ideology should Greek Americans consent to, given the political and cultural diversity of the nation?³⁰

In this ethnic history's equation of the national (however defined) with the ethnic, readers familiar with U.S. ethnic historiography will recognize a version of ethnic Americanism prevalent in elite-driven ethnic historical societies in the assimilationist early twentieth century. The stunning ideological resonance in the strategy of ethnic assimilation between these societies and *Greeks Americans* a century later merits the full citation below:

An obvious way [for the ethnic historical societies] to promote an inclusive Americanism was to investigate with scrupulous factuality those aspects of the history of one's own ethnic group that could find a ready welcome in a wider American culture. This approach—linking attainment of the [ethnic] group to the values of the nation—would in turn require a genuine hyphenated leadership, responsive to national and international values while simultaneously maintaining a particular ethnic heritage.³¹

Notably, *Greek Americans*' reading of *My Big Fat Greek Wedding* strikingly recalls the Swedish American historical society's agenda in the 1910s, as the latter also "labored to document conclusively the Americanness of their immigrant forebears."³² I have traced elsewhere how professional Greek American historiography circulated this version of ethnic Americanism in the 1960s and the 1980s.³³ This third edition is consistent with this historiographical line. It acknowledges ethnicity's internal diversity only to disavow it by endorsing ethnic preservation into a singular mold, which constitutes an extension of the nation.

To return to the ideology of identity as choice, *Greek Americans* recasts the melting pot ideology under conditions of multiculturalism. The boundaries between American and Greek have melted. On the one hand, the nation incorporates Greek ethnicity as its own. On the other hand, ethnicity contributes selective attributes, cuisine for instance, which are sanctioned by the nation and ultimately expand the boundaries of national culture. Ethnicity contributes to the making of a new America, albeit within the range of “acceptable difference.”³⁴ Through the lens of multiculturalism this melting does not erase the ethnic marker, as ethnicities have the authority to openly claim identity. But it places ethnicity in a dialectical relation with the nation to reach a synthesis: meatballs and spaghetti as both Italian and mainstream. “What is more American than having a delicious slice of lamb gyro at the festival?” the narrator in the documentary *The Greek Americans* (1999) asks. “It makes you feel like one of us. . . . The Greek food, dancing, cooking, talking and singing . . . we want you to be part of us.”³⁵ In this rhetoric of inclusion, ethnic practices are cast as American, while Americans are called upon to assimilate into ethnicity, which is also glossed as national. Ethnicity smoothly interweaves with the nation. This narrative encourages American people to “choose” to be ethnic in a manner that does not compromise national belonging. The choice is already culturally overdetermined, via the ethnic Americanism’s discourse of conflating national and ethnic belonging.

While *Greek Americans* links ethnic survival with freely chosen identity, there is a paradox. The book simultaneously views the individual as a free, self-determining agent while it approaches ethnic choice as a matter of regulating American multiculturalism from above; it advocates ethnic preservation as a result of regulative social engineering. In simultaneously casting ethnic survival as a matter of identity as choice and the cultural management of that choice, Peter Moskos follows an ideology deeply ingrained in American academic and popular culture: the coexistence of the conviction that a democratic America and its citizens are socially made—that is democracy is not a natural but a cultural entity—and the enduring operation of a “fundamental American cultural structure” (29) that endorses the view of the individual as self-determining of his own actions.³⁶ *Greek Americans* encapsulates this paradox. It acknowledges, albeit implicitly, the cultural embeddedness of the “choosing” individual.

The question of ethnic survival then points to a kind of cultural collection—films, documentaries, festivals, performances, and exhibits—that carefully selects the compatibility of

the displayed so-called Greek theme with so-called American values. The idea of classical Greece as the origins of American democracy, ethnic philanthropy, civic service, and love for community and family are all *topoi* of this discourse. To survive, ethnicity must script itself in conformity to national ideals and project itself solely in terms of acceptable difference. Like any project of cultural engineering, this solution shows that the operation of choice cannot possibly be divorced from social determinations. To be chosen, ethnic difference must check its credentials with national gatekeepers.

Toward Re/collecting U.S. Greek Identity

The question of ethnic survival cannot be disentangled from the question of cultural aspiration. It entails a vision of projecting oneself in the future, of becoming. What kind of identity does an ethnicity envision for itself, and for what purpose? This raises hard decisions for individuals, families, community leaders, scholars, artists, teachers, policy makers, and intellectuals. What aspects of culture should be promoted? Who decides the what, the how, and the where? What kinds of collections and re/collections are available to the public for this deliberation?

There is a raw pragmatism in the recommendation to collect Greek ethnicity in tandem with American ideals. The power of the strategy lies in its proven effectiveness. U.S. Greek festivals, as one of the most popular cultural spectacles, for instance, construct Greek America along the value of community, volunteerism, ordered celebration, multiethnic coexistence, roots, and apolitical and pleasurable difference, all national and ethnic values dear to nonconfrontational multiculturalism. Projecting a nonthreatening celebration of diversity, festivals furnish zones of cross-cultural interaction for pleasurable cultural consumption, connectedness across ethnic difference, and recognition of the humanity of American ethnics. Their vast popularity attests to their power to enhance the desirability of Greek ethnicity. In addition, they also serve as sites of community revitalization and ethnic reproduction, as the youth performs ethnicity under the society's approving applause. One could certainly expand the repertoire of these spectacles of identity to promote imaginative forms of expressive performances, stealing perhaps a page or two from the inclusivity and creativity of Greek Australian festivals. Festivals offer themselves as sites for a major re/collection: to explain to hosts and audiences alike not merely *what* "ethnics do" but *how* they value and engage practices;

an ethos of how they drink, how they socialize, how they prepare and consume food. Substantial knowledge of Greek worlds and skilled cultural translators are necessary for this kind of circulation.³⁷

Additional collections of Greek ethnicity as acceptable difference include documentaries, popular accounts—autobiographies, family biography, community histories—and elite narratives, which celebrate Greek Americans as family oriented, church loving, hardworking, bootstrap achievers, natural entrepreneurs, American patriots, and heirs of the classical Greeks. The self-portrait of Greek Americans as a model ethnicity, indeed as simultaneously “Model Americans” and “Quintessential Greeks,” as I have put it elsewhere, circulates highly in the public realm, projecting an undifferentiated image of identity as sameness to national audiences.³⁸

Any critique of this strategy of identity survival must anticipate its defense by powerful gatekeepers who systematically promote it. The benign image of ethnicity, an apologist would argue, ensures the safe integration of children against peer rejection. It motivates ethnic belonging and effectively reconciles dual identities, sparing the youth from agonizing, even traumatic, internal conflicts. It shields Greek Americans in those regions in the country skeptical or even hostile to ethnic difference, compared to multiethnic metropolises. It inspires powerful donors to fund heritage projects. It may be creating a hospitable environment for immigrant newcomers. It may function as the initial cultural bedrock on which to build nuanced representations of Greek. Intellectual elites, the reasoning may continue, can safely build a career in institutions that foster talk of resistance and radical difference. Have they experienced how dissent tastes in the workplace and the suburbs? A discussion of these questions is long overdue, a conversation that will illuminate the territory of ethnicity as well as the boundaries of multiculturalism. It will reveal as much about difference within Greek America as it will about the practice of difference within the United States.

Still, if one is committed to a pluralist ethos, an ideal of American multiculturalism, there can be no choice but to acknowledge the enormous cost in the strategy of soliciting approval via acceptable difference. The containment of ethnicity in exchange for survival exercises ethical and political violence because it obviously erases internal differences within the collective. In sanitizing ethnicity into a cultural caricature this constructed homogeneity denies the complex

humanity of hyphenated Americans. It insults American citizens whose education and sophistication demands knowledge beyond ethnic cliché. It angers those with the historical memory to recognize the partiality and injurious consequences of the bootstrap ideology. It alienates Greek Americans who practice American and Greek identities outside cookie-cutter cultural templates and renders invisible those Greek Americans who practice alternative lifestyles. It stifles cultural initiatives, such as language retention in early childhood, that are seen as antithetical to national trends.³⁹ Ultimately, the paradox of the singular narrative of ethnic Americanism must be brought into full view. While it seemingly endorses national values, its core narrative violates fundamental American principles, namely democratic inclusion and self-determination. What kind of freedom does an ethnicity practice, what choices does it really pursue, when it sets out to slavishly mimic what already is?

Are there alternative projects of re/collection to position Greek ethnicity in alignment with the nation? To begin this conversation, one can no longer treat “American” as a singular category. There is the America that sees patriotism as a matter of voicing a political conviction, and the America that sees patriotism as flag waving. One America animates dissent, the other rewards conformity. One national discourse advocates monolingualism, another doesn’t.

This framework opens up several major projects of re/collection. First, the exploration of how American people from all walks of life find meaning in contemporary Greek culture; how authors, artists, travelers, intellectuals, and ordinary Americans connect with Greek, and how this relation informs their lives and work. Second, the examination of how Greek Americans negotiate, combine, and inhabit the two worlds, including contradictions, coexistence of incompatible elements, and ambivalences. How, in other words, Greek America performs syncretism.⁴⁰ Third, the mapping of the ways in which various Greek American constituencies have been embracing American ideals (civil rights, affordable housing, gender equality, working-class Americanism) when these ideals find themselves under siege.

Let us re/collect how ethnicity and the nation intersect in these sorts of situations. This intercultural approach presents a fundamental difference from the narrative of acceptable difference: the latter entails passive acceptance of the status quo; the former underlines agency toward becoming.

Greek American Studies and the Project of Re/collection

Linking re/collection with the making of identity and community is a promising idea. If by ethnic survival we mean the continuous operation of a vital collective, not a conglomerate of privatized identities disconnected from and indifferent to each other, then it is befitting to explore re/collection and collective—two linguistic cognates—in conceptual relation to each other. In other words, let us examine how re/collection could make a collective and, in turn, reflect on the kind of collective it contributes in the making. This line of thinking becomes even more pronounced once we register that Greek America embraces an ethos of inclusivity, imagining itself as a diverse collective. This is how *Greek Americans* puts it: “You can be of Greece or not; you can be Greek Orthodox, or not; you can speak Greek or not; you can have a Greek name, unless you don’t.” You can also be an offspring of an interracial marriage, a “non-Greek” spouse, educator, or a philhellene. “Ultimately at least in the diaspora, there is no litmus test for Greekness other than self-identity” (216). In contrast to the nationalist narrative that makes blood ties the criterion for belonging, this is a post-ethnic (post-biological) construction of a cultural collective based on self-ascription. In an onslaught to the idea of authenticity and ethnic purity this narrative expands boundaries of belonging as it recognizes the collective’s internal diversity.

Any act of collection around a shared identity, or set of intersecting identities (gender and class for instance), creates and sustains a collective. It retrieves a host of texts, experiences, and voices and arranges them into a series—a collection of pasts, facts, and acts placed in new contexts—whose commonalities may resonate with a particular public. This is the manner in which dominant collections in Greek America, for instance, piece together collective identity. They produce arrangements of evidence and perspectives that coalesce around a set of attributes, namely socioeconomic success, bootstrap mobility, and ethnoreligious identity, which are then posited as the defining elements of the collective. Confronted with internal diversity, ethnic elites focus their collection efforts on scouting the archive selectively, to identify an image of sameness. They establish a solid cultural core upon which to anchor identity for their purposes. Once this image is projected as normative ethnicity, however, such collections sanction singularity. Their answer to heterogeneity is to manufacture homogeneity.

It should be clear by now that re/collection arises as a counter response to the problem of ethnic normativity. Re/collection projects, already carried out by feminists, advocates of racial equality, and activists for political causes, recover alternative histories to give voice to their respective collectives. Recovering histories of women, the working class, civil rights activists, bicultural and interracial families, the youth, the lives and work of authors and scholars, and alternative sexualities animates respective community narratives around shared experiences and memories. But because a community is not an island unto itself, a re/collection specific to a collective may also generate connections across a spectrum of collectives. Re/collection provides visibility and empowers previously silenced communities. It also opens a conversation about intersections and resemblances across difference.⁴¹

If a collection sustains a collective, re/collection multiplies collectivities. In this respect, re/collection may veer away from integration and proliferate fragmentation. One could think of several disjointed Greek American publics, which may not coalesce around an overarching commonality. The divide between secularist and religious Greek America is one example. Working-class immigrants and upper-middle-class American ethnics may be another. Or, one could register the gulf between those who are activists for cultural change and those for maintaining the status quo. Other fault lines abound. This is a social landscape crisscrossed by difference and punctuated by conflict, an unfolding reality succinctly captured in *Greek Americans* as “ethnic dissension and differentiation.” This is a contested terrain of agonistic coexistence.

Greek America, then, represents a fragile collective. Clashing interests make it vulnerable to dissolution. What is it that could possibly hold this tenuous entity together? As *Greek Americans* reports, this entity is prone to expanding its boundaries to accommodate internal diversity. This may work well when it comes to interpersonal acceptance, though one could caution against idealization. It is not certain at all, however, how this heterogeneity will be negotiated at the institutional level, whether dominant organizations will open their space to alternative re/collections.

Greek American studies is positioned to deliver precisely this function. Because its mission is to foster diverse knowledge, it represents an institutional site that hosts multiple interpretations of ethnicity. It finds itself in a place that encourages exploration of new forms of

cultural expression, continuities, and discontinuities and of questions such as the tension between an ethnicity's proclivity to hold on to a collective identity and its struggle to sustain multiplicity. And it is qualified to translate its collections and re/collections to diverse publics. Given that subcommunities within Greek America are not isolated islands but overlapping domains, Greek American studies could operate as a vital link contributing to a mutual understanding across a fragmented landscape.⁴² In the respect, it stands to carry out cultural transformation. The circumstances of the *Greek Americans* author's identity reinvention speak to this potential. Necessary for cultural democracy, re/collection requires the intellectual labor to imaginatively and responsibly carry out this work in publications, the classroom, and study abroad programs.⁴³

This challenge to Greek American studies inevitably brings attention to its human resources. Who will collect and re/collect ethnicity? Who will theorize its complexity? The scale of the undertaking is enormous, proportionate to the anguish we, scholars of Greek America, feel for our underrepresentation in the academy and our underresearched subject. As comedians, documentary makers, authors, filmmakers, popular historians, journalists, nonacademic anthropologists, poets, biographers, cultural activists, and museum curators keep narrating, performing, and proliferating the meaning of ethnicity, Greek American studies stretches its resources to keep up with this output, only to repeatedly realize its severe shortages. Greek Americanists, as I have noted elsewhere, "witness a thick cultural production leaving us behind."⁴⁴

Greek American or transnational Greek/U.S. studies requires institutional support. Our collection and re/collection, learning and re/learning require stable anchoring in academic spaces. It is necessary to ensure our vitality and produce a new generation of scholars, as the harsh reality of a thin academic market for our field casts a specter of anxiety in this aspiration. About the urgent need for professional research positions and university chairs that generate *inclusive* and *high-caliber* scholarship it seems we all agree. We envy thriving fellow American ethnic programs and research institutes as we lament the pace of our institutional development. Our calls for funding a professional national research center remain unanswered. The fact that we are part of a collective that celebrates its wealth and high education credentials only makes the compromised potential of our field harder to bear.

As we understandably seek external aid, we cannot afford not to reflect within, regarding our own public role. I have in mind a specific set of responsibilities, one in relation to the university and one beyond the college campus, in relation to the “community.” Greek American scholarship will remain at the very margins of, or render itself obsolete in, the academy if it fails to produce first-rate work in conversation with new scholarship. It may not work for nonacademic publics either, unless it undertakes public-minded scholarship.⁴⁵ The classroom and its pedagogies, as a site that brings together academic and public scholarship, require particular attention. All this with the deep awareness that drives this essay: as a cultural practice, knowledge about ethnicity matters greatly both for the Self and the Other. How can we position ourselves to effectively deliver this mission? As we contemplate the future of U.S. Greek ethnicity, the prospect of our field also remains uncertain. The two may be connected in a more powerful fashion that we currently allow ourselves to imagine. The struggle to advance Greek American studies will offer the material, in a future account, for a narrative of failure or success.

¹ For the notions of re/collection and history as cultural practice see, Josephine Lee, Imogene L. Lim, Yuko Matsukawa (2002); and Liakos (2010) respectively. Lee, Josephine, Imogene L. Lim, Yuko Matsukawa eds. *Re/collecting Early Asian America: Essays in Cultural History*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2002. Liakos, Antonis. “What is Historical Critique About?” *Historein* 10 (2010): 144–152. I also wish to thank Artemis Leontis, who offered key insights on the topic.

² For a discussion of this issue see Chock, Phyllis Pease. “‘The Self-Made Woman’: Gender and the Success Story in Greek-American Family Histories.” In *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*. Sylvia Yanagisako and Carol Delaney eds. New York: Routledge, 1995. 239–255.

³ For a latest example see Kappatos, Nicole. *Greek Immigration to Richmond, Virginia, and the Southern Variant Theory*. M.A. Thesis. VCU Theses and Dissertations, 2014. Paper 3483.

⁴ See, Georgakas, Dan. 2006. “Reading Charles Moskos.” *The National Herald*, May 27. Page 10. Special section, The Deans of Greek American Literature.

⁵ See Georgakas (1987), Chock (1990), Jusdanis (1991), Anagnostou (2010). Dan Georgakas. “Response to Charles C. Moskos.” *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* XIV.1&2 (1987): 63–71. Chock, Phyllis Pease. Charles C. Moskos *Greek Americans: Struggle and Success* (Book Review), *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 8.1 (1990): 149–151. Jusdanis Gregory. “Greek Americans and the Diaspora.” *Diaspora* 1.2 (1991): 209–223. Yiorgos Anagnostou. “Where does ‘Diaspora’ Belong? The Point of View from Greek American Studies.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 28.1 (2010): 73–119.

⁶ The shift away from Greek Orthodoxy does not necessarily translate into secularization. Non-Orthodox Greek Americans may connect with alternative religious affiliations. Ethnographic re/collection of this phenomenon may attend to the importance of region, as in the case of Greek identity and Eastern spirituality in California (I owe this point to Martha Klironomos). For an ethnographic example of Greek American identity intersecting with new age spirituality see Yiorgos Anagnostou. “‘That Imagination Called Hellenism:’ Connecting Greek Worlds, Past and Present, in Greek America.” *The Classical Bulletin* 80.2 (2004): 247–281.

⁷ See Kathleen Neils Conzen, David A. Gerber, Ewa Morawska, George E. Pozzetta and Rudolph J. Vecoli. “The Invention of Ethnicity: A Perspective from the U.S.A.” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 12.1 (1992): 3–41.

⁸ Dan Georgakas recalls this ethos in the author’s obituary: “He was also willing to change his mind. He was driven by reality, facts and social trends.” Lambrou-Evan C. “Charles Moskos, Leading Sociologist, Passes Away.” June 7, 2008. <http://www.thenationalherald.com/10307/> (Accessed August 1, 2014).

⁹ See Charles C. Moskos. *Greek Americans: Struggle and Success*. Second Edition, third printing. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1990. (Originally published in 1980 by Prentice-Hall, Inc.): 144.

¹⁰ This analysis is a rewording of the position I originally expressed in 2010: “Moskos justifiably criticized the reified dismissal of Greek America as a ‘pale reflection of an old country culture,’ recognizing ethnicity as a dynamic process, and rightly wishing to frame it in the context of its historical specificity” (Anagnostou 2010:86). Despite our agreement on this issue, Moskos tries to represent my position in negative terms by psychologizing it. His superficial interpretation is not merely a misreading, but a distraction from the fact that he systematically overlooks my scholarship, including its substantive critique of nation-centric history.

¹¹ Anagnostou (2010: 85–88). Yiorgos Anagnostou. “Where does ‘Diaspora’ Belong? The Point of View from Greek American Studies.” *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 28.1 (2010): 73–119.

¹² As Donna Gabaccia (1999: 1124) writes, “scholars now use the term diaspora to describe almost all migrants in order to highlight” links between the New World and the Old World.

¹³ Georgakas 2004-2005, 4. Georgakas Dan. “The Now and Future of Greek America: Strategies for Survival.” *Journal of Modern Hellenism* 21-22 (2004-2005): 1–15.

¹⁴ Historians of the Italian diaspora, let us note, were employing the transnational idea as early as the mid-1980s, using it to reject the immigrant paradigm upon which the “American ethnics” model draws its principal tenets. In my discussion the transnational framework also aims to bring Modern Greek studies in conversation with Greek American studies. Given Greek America’s transnational dimension, I use the terms Greek American studies and transnational Greek/U.S. studies interchangeably. There are of course alternative frames and scales of analysis such as local, regional and interregional, worldwide and global.

¹⁵ See Gabaccia 1999:1119. Gabaccia, Donna R. “Is Everywhere Nowhere? Nomads, Nations, and the Immigrant Paradigm of United States History.” *The Journal of American History* 86.3 (1999): 1115–1134. December.

¹⁶ A genealogical re/collection of national inclusion as a function of gender-based immigrant success as class mobility will reveal the presence of Social Darwinism in the discourse. As in the following oft-cited passage by anthropologist Henry Pratt Fairchild: “The business of the alien is to go into the mines, the foundries, the sewers, the stifling air of factories and workshops, out on the roads and railroads in the burning sun of summer, or the driving sleet and snow. If he proves himself a man, and rises above his station, and acquires wealth, and cleans himself up—very well, we receive him after a generation or two. But at present he is far beneath us, and the burden of proof rests with him.” Fairchild, Pratt Henry. *Greek Immigration to the United States*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1911: 237.

¹⁷ Mavratsas, Caesar. “Greek-American Economic Culture: The Intensification of Economic Life and a Parallel Process of Puritanization.” In *New Migrants in the Marketplace: Boston’s Ethnic Entrepreneurs*. Edited by Marilyn Halter. Foreword by Peter L. Berger, 97–119. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995.

¹⁸ The literature on the topic is vast. For nonacademic audiences the following work is eminently readable: Roediger, David. *Working Toward Whiteness: How America’s Immigrants Became White. The Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs*. New York: Basic Books, 2005. And, Brodtkin Karen, *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says About Race in America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1998.

¹⁹ Waldinger, Roger. “Foreigners Transformed: International Migration and the Remaking of a Divided People.” *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 12.2 (2003): 266–267.

²⁰ See Gazi, Effi. “Claiming History: Debating the Past in the Present.” *Historein* 4 (2003): 5–16. Liakos, Antonis. “What is Historical Critique About?” *Historein* 10 (2010): 144–152.

²¹ See Jacobson’s eloquent exposition, particularly the chapter “The Immigrant’s Bootstraps and Other Fables” (2006, 177–205). Jacobson, Frye Matthew. *Roots Too: White Ethnic Revival in Post-Civil Rights America*. Harvard University Press, 2006. For an extensive analysis also see, Anagnostou, Yiorgos. “White Ethnicity: A Reappraisal.” *Italian American Review* 3.2 (2013): 99–128.

²² For the debate see, Anagnostou, Yiorgos. “A Critique of Symbolic Ethnicity: The Ideology of Choice?” *Ethnicities* 9.1 (2009): 94–122.

²³ For specific examples of meaningful identity beyond symbolic ethnicity see, Anagnostou, Yiorgos. *Contours of “White Ethnicity”: Popular Ethnography and the Making of Usable Pasts in Greek America*, Ohio University Press, 2009.

²⁴ See, Sollors, Werner. *Beyond Ethnicity: Consent and Descent in American Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986: 6.

²⁵ See, Chock, Phyllis Pease. “The Outside Wife and the Divided Self: The Genesis of Ethnic Identities.” In *Discourse and the Social Life of Meaning*, Phyllis Pease Chock and June R. Wyman eds. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1986. 185–204.

²⁶ For a sociological analysis of Greek American youth beyond symbolic ethnicity see Bratsis, Peter. 2003. "The Constitution of Greek-Americans." Discussion Paper No. 9. The Hellenic Observatory, The European Institute. Available online, <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/5693/1/Bratsis-9.pdf>

²⁷ Georgakas Dan. "The Now and Future of Greek America: Strategies for Survival." *Journal of Modern Hellenism* 21-22 (2004-2005): 1–15.

²⁸ *Filotimo* also organizes a most recent narrative of Greek American identity. See, "The Greek Secret." (2014). Produced by *The Washington Oxi Day Foundation*, <http://www.oxidayfoundation.org/video-the-greek-secret/> (Accessed September 25, 2014).

²⁹ In an alternative reading, the popularity of the film hinges on its effectiveness to tap into a central American dilemma between the ideal of life as choice and the reality of life as a set of constraining forces. The film plays out the tensions between consent and descent, as the heroine endorses her daughter's freedom to choose her future partner, but she is also compelled to make language retention a nonchoice for her offspring. See Anagnostou, Yiorgos. "When 'Second Generation' Narratives and Hollywood Meet: Making Ethnicity in *My Big Fat Greek Wedding*." *MELUS* 37.4 (2012): 139–63.

³⁰ Understanding the making of Greek America as an object of cultural consumption deserves its own book project. Let us note that the desirability of an ethnicity does not necessarily require its conformity with middle-class moral values or positive stereotyping. It may be linked with an alternative range of fantasies, desires, and cultural needs. Simone Cinotto's observations about the cultural consumption of Italian ethnicity in relation to changing demographics are particularly instructive. He writes, "in the year 2000, the number of Americans reporting Italian ancestry increased by one million since the previous 1990 census—the equivalent of a new mass migration." He attributes this dramatic development to the "immense popularity of the HBO television series *The Sopranos* "dramatizing fascinating aspects of Italian family life, community culture, and consumer styles" (26); but also to a range of Italian American representations in popular culture, including uninhibited hedonism, which "let viewers vicariously experience the true, genuine, and transparent enjoyment of life and pleasure that middle-class self-discipline prevents them to experience, at least in everyday real life" (23). Cinotto, Simone. "Introduction – All Things Italian: Italian American Consumers, the Transnational Formation of Taste, and the Commodification of Difference." In *Making Italian America: Consumer Culture and the Production of Ethnic Identities*, Simone Cinotto ed., 1–31. Fordham University Press, 2014.

³¹ See, Higham, 1994:34. Higham John. "The Ethnic Historical Society in Changing Times." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 13.2 (1994): 30–44.

³² *Ibid*, p.35.

³³ Anagnostou, Yiorgos. "Where does 'Diaspora' Belong? The Point of View from Greek American Studies." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 28.1 (2010): 73–119.

³⁴ Urcuioli, Bonnie. "Acceptable Difference: The Cultural Evolution of the Model Ethnic American Citizen." *Democracy and Ethnography: Constructing Identities in Multicultural Liberal States*. Ed. Carol J. Greenhouse with Roshanak Kheshti. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998. 178–195.

³⁵ *The Greek Americans*. Videocassette. Produced by WLIW 21 Public Television & Veras Communications, Inc., 1998.

³⁶ Varenne, H. "Diversity as American Cultural Category," in *Democracy and Ethnography: Constructing Identities in Multicultural Liberal States*. C. Greenhouse and Roshanak Kheshti eds. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998. 27–49.

³⁷ Greek Americans do narrate identity as ethos. See, Anagnostou, Yiorgos. "Model Americans, Quintessential Greeks: Ethnic Success and Assimilation in Diaspora." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies* 12.3 (2003): 279–327.

³⁸ *Ibid*.

³⁹ *Greek Americans* takes the following position on language survival, presumably referring to early childhood initiatives: "America has been and will remain—not by law but by custom—an English-speaking country. Efforts to preserve Greek (or any other language) among a majority of assimilated American-born are doomed to failure" (79).

⁴⁰ See Lambropoulos, Vassilis. "Syncretism as Mixture and as Method." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 19.2 (2001): 221–235.

⁴¹ For a case study see, Jordan, Glenn. "Voices from Below: Doing People's History in Cardiff Docklands." In *Writing History: Theory and Practice*. Edited by Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, and Kevin Passmore. London: Arnold, 2003. 299–320.

⁴² For a starting point for this discussion see, Leontis, Artemis. "'What Will I Have to Remember?' Helen Papanikolas's Art of Telling." *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 29.2 (2003): 15–26.

⁴³ Notably, it was precisely the academy's commitment to plurality that worked well for the author of *Greek Americans*, as it contributed to his discovery of alternative Greek affiliations and consequent stark cultural transformation. I was puzzled therefore by his reticence to discuss Modern Greek studies programs as part of a strategy for ethnic survival, particularly at this juncture when high profile Greek American organizations (Elios Charitable Foundation, National Hellenic Society) embrace study abroad to Greece as a requirement for cultural revitalization. In an interview, Peter Moskos has underlined the necessity to "support college Greek studies programs" and language education at the university level. See, Sirigos E. Constantine, "New Edition of Greek Americans." *The National Herald Online* 07/18/14. <http://www.thenationalherald.com/52625/> (Accessed August 15, 2014). At the same time, it remains to be seen whether U.S. Greek scholars who have distinguished themselves in the U.S. academy in the areas of critical pedagogy, cultural politics, educational policy, heritage, hegemony, identity, bilingualism, and biculturalism will show any interest to take up these questions in reference to Greek America.

⁴⁴ Anagnostou, Yiorgos. "Where does 'Diaspora' Belong? The Point of View from Greek American Studies." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 28.1 (2010): 73–119.

⁴⁵ On the topic see Anagnostou, Yiorgos. "Public Scholarship and Greek America: Personal Reflections, Intellectual Vocations." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 33.1 (2015): 15–23.