THE SACRED SECT AND THE SECULAR CHURCH: SYMBOLS OF ETHNICITY IN ASTORIA'S GREEK COMMUNITY

by

ANDREA SIMON

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Anthropology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York.

1977

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Anthropology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

5/12/77
Date

Melvin Ember
Chairman of Examining Committee

5/12/77
Date

Sydel Silverman
Executive Officer

Professor Jane Schneider

Professor Eric Wolf

Professor Frederick Gearing
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ABSTRACT

THE SACRED SECT AND THE SECULAR CHURCH:
SYMBOLS OF ETHNICITY IN ASTORIA'S
GREEK COMMUNITY

Andrea Simon

The influence of social class on symbols of ethnic identity in the context of religious institutions has not been extensively studied in the United States. In this paper we compare two Greek Orthodox churches located in Astoria, the borough of Queens, New York. One is a spiritual sect; the other, a secularized church. Their respective communities hold different images of proper Greek behavior, exhibit different styles of dress, value different types of religious ceremonies, support different kinds of religious leaders, and immerse themselves in different ethnic and religious worlds. Their private lives are similarly distinctive. Each is organized respectively along egalitarian and hierarchical lines. The study is an attempt to link these different symbolic systems to the contrasting public and private life styles which, we argue, emerge from the particular class positions of these different church communities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

This is a study of two Greek Orthodox churches situated in the midst of a rapidly changing Greek immigrant and Greek American community in New York City. The two churches present a context to investigate differing behavioral patterns among the Greek immigrant and Greek American populations and the consequences for Greek ethnic identity. The community in which these churches are situated is class stratified. The population is composed of large numbers of new immigrants, refugees, earlier immigrants and American born Greeks. The study is an inquiry into the ways in which ethnicity and class intersect within the changing matrix of American society.

The two Greek churches reveal distinctive sets of symbols articulating ethnic identity. Through an analysis of these symbol sets, an attempt will be made to unravel the ways in which symbols express or mediate the crosscutting dimensions of ethnicity and class. Two arguments are developed to explain the selection of symbols and meanings assigned to them within each church. The first argument suggests that the symbolic forms associated with each church reflect the different adaptive strategies of church members. The second argument contends that these symbolic forms are differential expressions of order in social relations and are used by individuals to publicly deal with their positions in a social system.

The two Greek Orthodox Churches studied in this project are located a few miles apart in Astoria, New York: an older, well-maintained residential community in the northwest corner of Queens, in New York City. Since the early 1900's, Astoria has attracted large numbers of Greeks as well as members of other ethnic groups. The availability of affordable housing, the proximity of the area to transportation and industry, and the spacious, village-like nature

of the area, offered a most welcome change for most of these early settlers who were fleeing the dirt and noise of central city ghettos. Greeks began to settle in Astoria during the early 1920's. Until the past decade, the Greek community remained numerically small, politically unimportant, and economically peripheral to the larger Irish, Italian and German ethnic groups. Social relations with these other groups were considered cordial, if not intimate. Greeks, however, were delighted to immerse themselves into the Astoria community and follow the other groups in a parallel process of cultural assimilation.

When I began my field research, conditions in Astoria and particularly among its Greek population were changing. The children of the original ethnic settlers were abandoning Astoria for suburban communities. By the mid-1960's real estate values were declining and the facades of many commercial and residential buildings were deteriorating. At this time Astoria was infiltrated with thousands of new Greek immigrants, who settled in a dense enclave around the Ditmars section of the community. Unlike earlier Greek residents, and much to their dismay, the new immigrants were deviating from traditional patterns of settlement, from established norms for conduct, and from accepted political and economic arrangements within the community. In spite of these deviations and community censures, the new Greek has, in the minds of many, saved Astoria from residential decay and economic ruin. To others, however, the newcomer is providing an unwelcome reminder of the immigrant's past struggles to overcome social stigmatization and the ordeals of incorporation in the mainstream of Astoria's and America's social life.

Confrontation of established and new immigrant populations has resulted in a new conceptualization and public articulation of Greek ethnic identity. Outsiders often lump all Greeks in Astoria into a single ethnically-

defined population. Insiders are aware of the subtly defined cliques and more grossly delineated sub-communities. These distinctions have frequently found public expression in the Greek Orthodox churches servicing the spiritual and secular needs of the community. It was for this reason that we focused on the two churches studied in this project.

St. Demetrios and St. Markela reflect two conflicting views of what constitutes proper Greekness, i.e., proper behavior, proper dress, proper manners, proper business practices, proper religious leadership, proper values and beliefs, and so forth. St. Demetrios is the older "established" church in the community. Immigrants from the pre-World War II period, the children of these immigrants, and refugees from the post-World War II period constitute the core of its membership. The church and its priests present what my informants referred to as a modern, progressive, secular, Americanized approach to religion, to religious institutions, and to the respective roles of priests and layity, men and women, parents and children in both the institution itself and in the private lives of these Greeks. In a sense St. Demetrios serves as a model of this segment of the community and a model for these Greeks of how to order their lives and deal with daily contingencies.

St. Markela is a rebel church in the community, one of several which have sprung up since the early 1950's. It is regarded by its supporters as a pure, warm, gracious, untainted form of Greek Orthodoxy. Its leaders are considered to be superior spiritual practictioners. Their deeds are selfless; their concerns primarily spiritual. At St. Markela, that which is proper and good at St. Demetrios is viewed as vile, materialistic, defiling subversions of traditional Greek purity.

The period of immigration was one dimension dividing these two church

communities. A second was self-defined differences of socio-economic class. Parishioners attending St. Demetrios defined themselves as members of the middle class. Participants in St. Markela viewed themselves as working class. Definitions of class position, for the purpose of this study, reflect a self-defined classification scheme. Occupational criterion did not always coincide with individual designations of class position.

Much of the material in the dissertation was gathered during informal conversations with a multitude of Greek residents in the community. I conducted sixty-five in-depth interviews with members of the St. Demetrios church and thirty interviews with members of St. Markela. It is difficult to ascertain the representativeness of this sample. St. Markela keeps no membership records and accurate evaluations of church supporters is impossible to assess. At the same time, membership records at St. Demetrios are not an indicator of church support. Survey and personal sources of data suggest that Greeks who regularly attend the church are not formal church members while formal church members often play little role in church operations and attend church services infrequently.

Indeed, in a 1968 survey of a sample of the Greek community, only 45% declared themselves active members of some church and 90% of these attended St. Demetrios. But of this 90% (or 49 members), 38% (19 respondents) attended every Sunday and 22% (11 respondents) only attended on major holidays. In fact very few of these active members participated in church functions. Only 4% of those sampled attended St. Markela. But this was in 1968, just at the start of the new migration of Greeks into the United States.

The study, from the beginning, never assumed that most Greeks attend church. Active participation or membership in a Greek Orthodox church is not a necessary condition for Greek ethnic identity nor for Greek Orthodox

religiosity. The study deals with the way in which those Greeks who do attend, socialize in and politically organize Greek Orthodox churches utilize symbols to define community boundaries around these social arenas.

Secondary source material for the study consisted of information from migration records, census reports, and church documents. The prohibition against collecting ethnic data in census reports severely limited the utility of these records. Various estimates have been made of the Greek community in New York City. These range from 350-400,000 people. However, the 1970 census counted only 63,854 Greeks in New York City. Census records for Astoria are similarly restricted. Greeks are placed into the category of "other white ethnic." Hence we cannot use census tracts to establish a population baseline for the study. Estimates from community leaders place the Greek community in Astoria at 40-60,000. The problem is further complicated by what we know to be a large, ill-defined group of illegal alien Greeks.

In light of the difficulty in defining the parameters of the Greek population in New York, the two churches were selected as arenas of Greek social interaction. That they subsequently revealed alternative conceptualizations of Greek ethnicity and were found to attract different segments of the Greek population provides the subject of this study.

The study is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter I is an historical description of the Greek experience of migration and settlement in America. In Chapter II we describe the setting of the study, Astoria, and the cultural, economic, political and social impact of the new influx of Greek immigrants on the older settlement of Greeks and other ethnic groups. Chapters III and IV are detailed discussions of the two churches which serve as the focus of the study.

In Chapter V we set forth two analyses of these contrasts. The first considers the role of these symbolic differences in light of the adaptive strategies pursued by the different sectors of the Greek population supporting each church. The second discusses the use of these symbol sets as articulators of distinctive social orders exhibited by each community. In Chapter VI we consider the implications of the data and the arguments for anthropological understanding of the intersection of ethnicity and class in immigrant populations.

Chapter I

The Greeks in America: An Overview

The Greek experience in America is marked by the stresses of conflict and compromise. Individuals, families, and communities struggled to adapt to a new society--to its myths of success, to its demands for cultural conformity, to its ethos of freedom and its reality of ethnic confrontation. The Greek's response to these ideals and to the more stark realities was typically one of community fragmentation. Various institutions attempted to serve as foci for community cohesion and individual identification. Yet, divisions within each institutional sphere thwarted efforts at group integration. The history of Greek migration and settlement in America is best understood in terms of the forces underlying this on-going friction and factionalism, and the varied approaches institutions pursued to resolve it. In microcosm, the present differences and divisions between the two churches in Astoria reflect typical problems experienced by Greeks adjusting to American life in other communities and at other times.

There are few clear-cut divisions separating major periods of Greek migration to America. The period from 1880 through 1929 is called by Greeks, the "Period of the Pioneers." Within that period from 1920 - 1929 there took place a separate migration of Greek refugees from Asia Minor. Immigration during the 1930-40 depression decade and the Second World War was restricted by U.S. quota regulations and deteriorating economic conditions in the United States and Civil War in Greece. Immigration did not increase again until special refugee legislation, in the post-war period, enabled war victims to enter the United States during the 1950's and early 1960's. The most recent period of

immigration did not begin until the late 1960's when major changes in United States immigration laws eliminated quota restrictions. For each of these periods we consider the pushes driving Greeks to emigrate, the conditions in the United States enticing them to settle here, the difficulties Greek immigrants encountered in their efforts to establish themselves in America, and the development of institutions within Greek communities to assist or retard the immigrant's incorporation into American society.

The Pioneers and the Refugees: The Early Period of Immigration

The first major migration of Greeks to America coincided with the massive movements of populations to the United States from southern and eastern Europe from 1880 to 1910. For the Greeks, as for many of these other immigrants these early decades of immigration were part of a general rural-urban migration of peasants to the industrializing urban centers of Europe, or to the industrializing cities of America. Most Greeks migrated to the United States to find temporary, quick economic success and then rapidly return to Greece. The pressures which drove them from their farms, however, were never to lessen. The opportunities in America were to capture their imaginations. In retrospect, success never let them return home again.

The pressures driving Greeks from their homeland are part of an ancient saga of poverty, overpopulation, excessive taxation, endless military conscription, and expensive dowries. While these conditions traditionally plagued the Greek peasant, it was only in the late nineteenth century that Greeks were able to pursue other opportunities to the endless cycle of agricultural poverty. Government restrictions on migration were lifted, rapid steamboat transport across the Atlantic permitted affordable avenues to America, and America offered economic opportunities, both real and imagined, for

the unskilled peasant.

The immediate crisis precipitating Greek emigration was the financial ruin of Greek currant production in 1890. In the 1870's, currant production replaced olive groves in the Peloponnesus as the principle cash crop. France and Russia, primary consumers of currants, and in the past, major producers of the crop, suffered a severe economic depression in early 1870, after a widespread phylloxera epidemic wiped out crop production. As currant prices soared, Greek farmers converted their olive groves into currant plantations. By the 1890's however, France and Russia were again producing large crops of currants for their own use as well as for export. To protect currant production in their own countries, they imposed restrictive tariffs on currant imports. Unable to sell their crops at competitive prices, Greek farmers faced financial ruin. For many, the only solution was to mortgage their farms and migrate either to the slowly industrializing Greek cities or to other countries (Salutos, 1964). Most of western Europe had already shipped its excess peasant populations to America. Much of eastern Europe was now doing the same. For Greeks, America was the best prospect for finding economic opportunities--perhaps the only ones for survival.

By the early 1900's, immigration slowly shifted to areas outside the Peloponnesus. In addition to endless poverty, the pressures of taxation and military conscription, as well as the continuous prospects of war with Turkey, drove Greeks to emigrate from areas such as Boetia and Attica, from the mountainous northern regions, and from the Aegean Islands. By the eve of the Balkan War in 1912, in fact, an estimated two-thirds of the men of military age in Attica and Boetia had left the country. In Corinth, only priests and school teachers were left to serve in the army. By 1913, the situation had deteriorated

to a point that the Greek government had to impose rigid regulations on Greek emigration (Salutos, 1964; Vlachos, 1968).

Turkey's occupation of Thessaly and Macedonia after the first World War similarly effected Greeks in the disputed northern areas. Under the pressures of Turkish military conscription and land confiscation, and with olive prices falling, Greeks struggled to emigrate.

The difficulties in providing dowries for daughters was a constant factor driving Greeks to emigrate. For most Greeks, honorable marriages were arranged only if the family provided respectable dowries. With land fragmentation damaging farm productivity, land could no longer be used for dowries without jeopardizing family survival. Yet, for many Greeks, land remained the only source of wealth. Fathers, and even sons and daughers, worked as wage laborers to augment their meager land holdings and provide some dowry payment. Wages were low and jobs were difficult to find. Migration provided one avenue for supplementing family resources. As more males emigrated, however, the difficulties of finding eligible spouses increased for those women remaining in the villages. Dowry prices escalated, leaving daughters dependent on their families for longer periods of time. The result was that more and more males emigrated outside of Greece in search of wage labor (Salutos, 1964).

This early period of migration was primarily all male in composition. Most migrants were seeking alternatives to agriculture, not to life in Greece. Few fled as families. Most tried to use their wages to sustain their lands and families in Greece. For the period from 1899-1910, 95 percent of the Greek immigrants entering the United States were males (Salutos, 1964). This chain-like migration typically consisted of one member of a family emigrating, establishing himself in some job in America, and sending home money to support

his family and permit another relative or villager to emigrate. An estimated ten to twelve thousand Greeks returned to Greece from 1908-1912 suggesting that the migration was not permanent in nature. Greek men were frequently returning to marry or pay off debts, or to resettle in their villages. Others viewed their situation as one of migrant laborers. Monetary remittances during this period are estimated to have reached four-five million dollars each year.

Most of the immigrants were unskilled agricultural workers. There are no precise figures on the occupational composition of these early immigrants. That most were traveling in steerage suggest that these were not middle class merchants nor political exiles. The middle class, in fact, was growing during this period. By 1907 there were close to half a million Greeks classified as members of the middle class in a total population of 1.6 million. In fact, there was already an estimated one lawyer for every 828 people and one doctor for every 888 people (Salutos, 1964). The middle classes had little reason to leave Greece at this time. The value of the drachma was rising; Greek shipping was prospering; the flow of U.S. dollars from immigrants back into the Greek economy was expanding. With the rise of democratically-oriented Venizelos government in 1909, the middle classes and their interests began to triumph. For the peasantry, however, these changes had little impact and gave them little reason to remain in Greece.

Figures from U.S. immigration records suggest the general trend in migration from Greece. Table I documents this pattern. Between 1900 and 1907, 21,300 immigrants left the ports of Patras, Kalamata, and Zante for New York. Records do not show how many more left other Greek ports or passed first through European countries before reaching the United States. Immigration during the first World War remained surprisingly high and post-war figures

were even larger.

In 1914, for example, 10,969 Greeks emigrated for the United States. In 1918, after the war, 26,496 Greeks emigrated for this country. Two-thirds of these immigrants came from the mainland. The rest came from Rhodes, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Albania, Rumania, and Armenia (Salutos, 1964).

A. Settlement Patterns

These early communities of all male immigrants generally congregated in America's urban centers, with immigrants from similar villages and regions concentrating in localized sections of these cities. (Hutchinson, 1956, Price in Borrie, 1959, and Vlachos, 1968, provide census report figures which suggest the overwhelming tendencies for Greeks to settle in large urban centers for the post-1920 period to 1960. Data from recent immigration reports suggest that the pattern persists among the more recent immigrants). The major centers for Greek settlement were New York, Chicago, Boston and Lowell, Massachusetts, Philadelphia and San Francisco. Communities in the south and west were smaller and more scattered, but again restricted essentially to urban areas. Despite these urban preferences we should note that Greeks were among the more widely dispersed of all the immigrants settling in America during this same period (Carpenter, 1927).

There were several reasons for this urban concentration of Greek migrants. While the majority of Greeks had been peasants or farmers, very few sought agricultural pursuits or rural life in America. (This pattern was very typical of the earlier Irish settlement in America and of the Italian migration which coincided with the Greek period of immigration. For a discussion of the Irish aversion to rural life, see Jones, 1960; for an analysis of the Italian concentration in urban centers, see Lopreato, 1970). Much of the American

frontier and the free lands in the far west had, by the time of Greek migration, already been claimed and cultivated. Agricultural life in this country was socially structured in ways far different from that of peasant Greece. Farms in America were generally scattered. Houses were spatially dispersed, not clustered in villages as in Greece. American farming was facing a period of major mechanization. Few Greeks had either the financial ability or the technical skills to mechanize a farm. Most of the earlier settlers in the Plains and Northwest Territory were of German, Scandinavian or Scottish descent. They were Protestant. And, in general, they were unreceptive to the settlement of Greek Orthodox immigrants in their farming areas.

Perhaps the most important reason why the Greek gravitated towards the city was that the immigrant sought not to permanently resettle in America but to temporarily find wage employment and rapidly return to Greece--a richer man for his efforts. Land symbolically represented permanence, birthright, home. The Greek migrant laborer wanted only money so he could keep his home. Few had the funds to take them beyond their initial port of disembarkation. Those that did pursue jobs beyond this initial landing site went to industrializing cities or to work on the railroads in the far west. Their intent was not to find permanent homes in the hinterland.

B. Greeks in Pursuit of Streets of Gold

The cities also provided the Greek with jobs--jobs which needed his unskilled but highly motivated brawn. Factory labor and railroad construction were two of the major occupations employing Greeks. In 1907, an estimated 30,000 to 40,000 of the 150,000 Greeks in America were employed in railroad construction or in factories (Salutos, 1964, provides an extensive discussion

of the Greek's life in these two particular occupations. He is particularly elaborate in his description of the role of the padrone in directing young Greeks into these jobs.) For those not employed in construction or production, the streets of the cities offered endless opportunities for economic success. In most cities, the earliest arrivals joined other immigrants in the street trades. Flower peddlers, candy stands, cigar and shoe shine operations crowded the streets in both the Greek ghetto areas and in the neighboring districts. Often the Greeks competed with the other immigrants for control over street corners. As one Washington correspondent wrote in 1904, "Not everyone knows that ninety-nine of every hundred itinerant vendors is a Greek and that every Georgios or Demetrios among them, boy or man...is a small capitalist and carries anywhere from fifty to several hundred dollars concealed about his person" (Washington Post, December 27, 1904). In 1907, the consul general in New York City estimated that of the 150,000 Greeks in the United States, two-thirds were employed as bootblacks, waiters, and clerks in stores catering to the immigrant trade. Some were shopkeepers or owners of groceries, coffee houses, saloons, cleaning and pressing shops, laundries and print shops, meat markets and brokerage firms (Sphaira, 1907).

Greeks entering these particular economic fields discovered that there was extensive competition from other immigrant groups for the same corners, the same clientle, the same construction jobs, and so forth. Competition occasionally resulted in outright conflict, as occurred in some of the Western states where Greeks were used by contractors to perform jobs of other immigrants but at lower wages. Other bosses used the Greeks to break strikes and cross picket lines (Salutos, 1964).

At other times, and often despite the occasional conflict, Greeks

reached symbiotic existences next to other immigrant populations. Over time, occupational domains and spatial territories were divided among the immigrant communities in such a way as to effectuate a balance among them and peace if not mutual assistance between them. This was particularly the case in New York City where Greeks, Jews, Italians, Irish and Blacks as well as other ethnic communities, seemed to reach some balance in their interrelations, each occupying particular economic zones or sharing zones where ethnic criteria were neutralized by profit considerations. (Glazer and Moynihan, 1970, offer one analysis of the development of an interethnic balance in economic and political relationships within New York City. Data on the Greeks in New York are inferential, based on research by Tavuchis, 1968, and myself. Additional information on the Greek experience in American business is recorded by Constant, 1945, 1946a, 1946b, 1947, in the Athene.)

Greek immigrants settling in New York in the early twentieth century faced two problems: the Irish who controlled the political machinery of the city and thousands of other immigrants, particularly from eastern Europe and Italy, who, like the Greek, were settling in New York at the same time, seeking the same type of jobs and possessing the same kinds of skills (or lack of skills). In many respects these immigrant populations were identical in demographic make-up (i.e., they were largely all male and young immigrants), they were peasants, and they sought quick economic success. Almost all had little knowledge of American life. Most sought emotional, economic and social support from others like themselves and clustered in ghetto-like areas of the city. Most were naive about American political systems and suspicious of those who controlled these systems. In New York, by and large, the Irish controlled the political system at the turn of the century, and it was with the Irish politician

and the Irish policeman that the new immigrant had to initially contend.

The Greeks, as well as the other immigrant groups in New York seemed to pursue their economic goals along two routes. Either they attempted to develop services needed by their own ethnic enclave, or they styled their services to the needs of the larger, multi-ethnic, urban, regional, or even national consumer markets. To some degree, each group developed commercial interests catering to its own particular cultural needs. In local Italian enclaves in New York, Italians opened bakeries, delicatessens, groceries, fruitstands, and restaurants to serve their fellow Italians with goods from Italy and tastes that they demanded. Jews similarly operated kosher and nonkosher meat markets, retail shops, and bakeries which offered foods and merchandise suited to the taste of the Jewish immigrant. On a smaller scale, Greeks also cultivated a commercial section devoted to the particular needs of the Greek community.

In the city as a whole, however, Greeks, Italians, Jews and Irish, as well as the other ethnic groups, vied for control over the larger commercial and manufacturing interests. It was often in this arena that inter-ethnic conflict emerged. While the Italians struggled with the Irish for control of the construction industry, the Jews gained command of the garment manufacturing and fur industries, often with Greek, Jewish and Italian tailors, seamstresses, and furriers. The Irish controlled the police, fire and other civil service jobs. The Italians, Jews and Greeks also competed with each other in the wholesale food business, in produce hauling, and the trucking and moving industries.

All of these groups met on the corner stands where they struggled to outsell each other as florists, fruit and vegetable vendors, and street peddlers. Greek immigrants often started as street vendors. Peddlers required small initial investments, little overhead and a minimal knowledge of English.

Business was brisk in New York where competition was keen and prices fluctuated by the minute. While the Irish police plagued them and store owners complained against their prices, the Greeks managed to successfully exploit the streets, even competing with more successful Greeks who had opened legitimate shops.

One of the earliest of these street vending professions was shoe-shining. Early immigrants from the Peloponnesus were particularly numerous and successful first as street-corner boot-blacks and later as proprietors of chains of shoe-shining parlors. By adding hat-cleaning, shoe repair and the dry cleaning of clothes, many of these early entrepreneurs became highly prosperous and dignified store owners. The history of the Greek experience in the wholesale and retail flower shops and in fruit and vegetable vending, as well as in candy manufacturing was much the same as that of the shoe-shine parlor operators. To move from the street corner to a small shop required a small capital outlay. While some Greeks moved into enlarged retail operations in this manner, others expanded into wholesale distribution to serve these retail concerns. Greeks in New York were particularly successful in developing the confectionary and ice cream industries. The small companies which first started producing Greek pastries and sweets catered to the demands of Greek coffee houses, restaurants and grocery stores, as well as to the weddings, christenings and nameday celebrations of Greeks. Most Greeks, however, continued to make pastries in their homes. The Greek who shifted to the general public grew the more successful in this business. Shops grew so rapidly that they quickly surpassed the shoe-shine parlors and groceries in prestige. (Much of this information is developed from the life histories of informants who, in fact, developed the wholesale flower industry, fruit and vegetable wholesaling, Bungalow Bar IceCream,

the manufacturing of ice cream cones, the production of candy and cake for large-scale consumption, and the expansion of dry-cleaning store chains.)

The restaurant industry, particularly the Greek diner, also developed as an arena in which Greeks were successful. Many newly arrived immigrants during this period set up food stands for Greek workers near factories. Greeks often worked long distances from their homes, and many had no wives to cook for them. The quick food stand served an important function providing meals for these workers. As police pressure pushed some of these stands off the street, and as these vendors accumulated capital, many invested in small restaurants to provide the same services in more comfortable surroundings. Once established, they then offered later immigrants jobs as cooks, counter boys and dishwashers--work which required a minimal knowledge of English and which could provide adequate income in exchange for long hours of work. (One informant active for thirty years in the waiters union estimated that 65% of the waiters in the union were Greek in 1970. The union services primarily the major restaurants and hotels and may not reflect those waiters employed in smaller establishments.)

This picture of the Greek experience in New York during these early years provides some indication of types of occupations and the patterns of mobility pursued by the early immigrant. During this time period, Greeks were forced to pursue these economic goals largely without institutional support. Unions were non-existent or poorly organized to deal with the new immigrant. A padrone system operated to bring young Greeks into the country, find them jobs and skim part of their meager salaries for the support of the padrone. The system was able to direct immigrants into certain occupational niches. Shoe-shine parlors, for example, and particularly railroad construction were

typically exploited by the padrone. It was not until the 1920's that the system began to lose its effectiveness. Political pressure on the padrone, the demise of the shoe-shine parlor as a necessary institution, and the decline in railroad construction rendered the system inoperative. (Salutos, 1964, provides an extensive discussion of the benefits and abuses of the padrone system as it functioned among the Greeks. Lopreato (1970) offers some comparative material on the padrone system as it worked among the Italians.)

Greeks in general found jobs, accumulated capital and pursued better opportunities essentially on their own. The organizations which did emerge in the ghetto served different purposes or provided aranas in which these individuals could construct social networks which might facilitate their economic interests apart from collective concerns of the organization itself.

C. Community Building and Voluntary Organizations

In the early, all male Greek enclaves, young Greek men sought companionship from fellow villagers or from those Greeks originally from the same region. Greeks, to some degree, brought along a strong sense of village and regional identity cultivated over generations in their homeland. (Sanders, 1962, provides an extensive discussion of the past and present attachment of Greeks to their land, their homes, and their region.) Yet within the ghetto itself, conditions existed to strengthen these ties and convert them, eventually, into formal organizations. Housing was one factor which fostered a sense of village and regional identity during this early period. Conditions were cramped, damp, dark and dirty, in the poorest, most dilapidated sections of the city. Either through the efforts of padrones or via letters from fellow villagers, new immigrants gravitated to live with others from their home village or from the same

region. Fellow villagers were men who spoke the same dialect, or at least the same language, shared common kinsmen or knowledge of those kinsmen, and knew similar codes of conduct and the sanctions reinforcing them from the old homeland. The loneliness of the new immigrant was intense. As one immigrant wrote, "we are all strangers and no one talks to us, only they push us in all directions....There are no jobs for us here outside of railroad construction and similar things....It is a real hell with the street urchins....real devils" (Giannakoulis, 1959, in Vlachos, 1968).

For these earliest immigrants, the regional associations provided one focus for reconstructing life in the new country and sustaining connections into the old. (Park and Miller, 1921, offer one of the earlier discussions of the importance of these associations for the new immigrant. Their analysis, despite considerable refinement by scholars from other disciplies studying voluntary associations in other contexts remains an important theoretical analysis of the emergence and functions of these institutions in America. Hammer, 1976, provides a review of the more recent literature on voluntary associations among immigrants.) Some of these organizations emerged spontaneously as immigrants living in the same section of a city came together on a regular basis to socialize, share information from the homeland, play cards, or sit in a taverna. Other organizations were deliberately formed to serve some purpose either for the immigrant or the home community. In August, 1904, for example, an appeal was made in the Greeklanguage newspaper in Chicago, The Greek Star, to remind all Chrysafitans not to forget the needs of their village in the homeland. The following January, fifteen Chrysafitans met to form an organization which raised funds to build new water works in the home village. In the same newspaper a similar appeal was

made to all Afysiotans in America to pool their funds to help build a church back home. For the immigrant, it was a sacred and patriotic cause. Each appeal, and many more like them in cities across America, resulted in the formation of immigrant associations (Yeracaris, 1950).

Greek immigrants demonstrated a mania for local or topika societies which many Americans found difficult to comprehend. Every village, even minute parishes in Greece found representation in the United States. Each organization had an extensive array of cultural paraphernalia, banners, constitutions, and important sounding names. Most organizations, particularly in the early periods, were composed of anywhere from fifteen to thirty people. Each had a council of twelve to fifteen officers all of whom wore, as often as possible, the gold tassels and buttons signifying their positions. As early as 1907 there were an estimated 100 societies in existence in the United States. In New York alone there were thirty; in Chicago, fifteen (Yeracaris, 1950; Salutos, 1964).

Most of these early organizations were understandably formed by men. Women's organizations and women's auxiliaries to the men's organizations only began to emerge in the 1910-1920 period (Yeracaris, 1950). As each association began to grow, it developed its own coffee houses, restaurants and political clubs, where these men could continue many of the same social patterns they had followed in Greece. Frequently the organization permitted these Greeks to find work together. Certain work crews in railroad construction, for example, were completely filled by men from Lacedemonia or Thessaly or Macedonia or Crete (Salutos, 1964).

During this period of early immigration, a second type of association emerged which attempted to forge a unity among all Greeks regardless of their

regional backgrounds. Typical of this organization was the Pan-Hellenic Union. Its purpose was quite different from that of the local associations. The Union was formed in 1907 in New York for the express purpose of assisting its members to return to Greece. It was created to perpetuate the Greek faith and language, and to continue to supply Greece with loyal fighters in times of military conflict at home. During the Balkan Wars, the Union converted itself into a paramilitary organization to recruit Greeks for the Greek military. The organization fell into disrepute after limited success in recruiting immigrants for the war. Many Greeks questioned the legality, as well as the morality of being coerced to serve in a semi-military organization in America for the sake of Greece. The strength of the Union declined with America's entrance into the First World War. Political conditions in Greece were unstable and many immigrants were unwilling to commit themselves to an organization clearly identified with royalism and neutrality.

Many Greeks were also beginning to confront the problem of national loyalties. Those Greeks entering the professions or successful in business were reluctant to relinquish their gains for the sake of their homeland. Nativist groups in America were pressuring Greeks and other immigrants to clarify their political positions and disclaim loyalties to other nations--even those of one's ancestry. Nativist American groups were particularly active during these decades preaching an anti-foreignism which, to many Greeks was designed to drive them out of business. Greeks had, since their first large settlement in America faced the forces of nativists. Early nativism in America developed in the 1840's in response to the Irish Catholic influx. During the Civil War and in the decades after, nativism remained dormant or at least underground. With the immigration of Southern and Eastern Europeans around the turn of the

century, nativist forces joined with labor and management and with social Darwinists to protest the new influx of foreigners and agitate for restrictive legislation against them (Jones, 1960; Anderson, 1970; Feldstein and Costello, 1974).

The difficulties of deciding how to contend with the nativists and their demands for national conformity were compounded by the changes occurring within Greek communities. The previously all male, migrant-like enclaves were undergoing two kinds of transformations. One change was developing internally: men were marrying, either Greeks from the homeland or non-Greeks, and they were forming familial and kinship groupings. The other occurred as the result of the influx of refugees during the 1920's from the Greco-Turkish conflict in Asia Minor.

The first set of changes is difficult to document. There are no census or other records on the demographic composition of Greek communities during this period and the Greek Orthodox Church has no record of the marriages, births and deaths for these early decades. We can only suggest the type of transformations taking place. Return migration to Greece during these years was high. Between 1908 and 1912, 40,718 aliens departed for Greece, and between 1913 and 1917, 58,365 emigrant aliens gave Greece as their future point of residence. (Data are from the Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Emigration, 1908-1917). Some Greeks were returning to fight in the Balkan Wars. Many, however, returned to Greece to marry and oversee family affairs in the village. Some of these repatriates returned to the United States without their wives and children. Others brought their families along or sent for them soon after they arrived here. Despite this return migration intermarriage rates in many areas were high, which suggest that Greeks were marrying non-Greeks

and remaining in the United States. Drachsler, (1920), for example, found that 22.14 per 100 Greek marriages were with non-Greeks in New York City in the period from 1908-1912. Regardless of from where these wives came, families were settling down in these Greek communities. Return migration to Greece diminished in the period from 1923-1927 to half its previous five-year level. The size of the total Greek stock in the United States was increasing gradually but the proportion of Americans born of Greek or mixed parentage was growing dramatically. Table I gives a picture of the numbers of immigrants landing in America during this time period. Table II documents the numbers of immigrant aliens leaving for Greece. Table III records the proportion of Greek born and American born of Greek descent for the same time span.

While these male migrants were finding new stability in their communities, political conditions in Turkey were driving Greeks into exile from Asia Minor. The aftermath of the First World War left the northern and eastern regions of Greece and the fate of the Greek population in Turkey undecided issues. Turkey continued to struggle to gain control over Constantinople, and over Macedonia and Thrace in Greece. Border conflicts continued until the early 1920's when Turkey routed the Greek troops in Constantinople. Greek civilians throughout Turkey were driven from their homes, and in many cases literally into the sea (Housepian, 1966). Hostilities between the two countries were resolved in 1924 with the exchange of two million Christians and Moslems between the two territories. Greece was hardly able to cope with the million stateless refugees flooding into her ports. Some of the landless farm families (approximately 300,000 of them) were resettled on lands confiscated from fleeing Turks or on reallocated large estates. Most of the refugees, however, were confined to makeshift relief camps along the coast from Athens to Salonika.

Table I

Immigration of Greeks to the United States
by Ten-Year Intervals 1891 - 1920

Years	Number
1891 - 1900	15,979
1901 - 1910	167,519
1911 - 1920	184,201

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office) 1972.

Table II

Emigrant Aliens Deported who Gave Greece as Country of Intended Future Residence. Five-year Intervals 1908 - 1957

Years	Number
1908 - 1912	40,718
1913 - 1917	58,365
1918 - 1922	59,711
1923 - 1927	25,106
1928 - 1932	7,106
1933 - 1937	3,504
1938 - 1942	1,274
1943 - 1947	585
1948 - 1952	2,135
1953 - 1957	3,171

Source: Annual Reports of the Commissioner General of Emigration 1908 - 1932; Statistical Abstract of the United States 1932 - 1958.

Table III

Greek Stock in the U.S., 1850 - 1960

Year	Total	Greek-born	Native White of Greek of Mixed Parentage
1850	-	86	-
1860	-	328	-
1870	-	390	-
1880	-	776	-
1890	-	1,887	-
1900	-	8,515	-
1910	111,249	101,264	9,985
1920	228,055	175,526	52,083
1930	303,751	174,526	129,225
1940	326,672	163,252	163,420
1950	364,318	169,083	195,235
1960	377,973	158,894	219,079

Source: 1850 - 1900: Carpenter, Niles 1920 Immigrants and Their Children. Bureau of the Census 1927 Monograph VII, Washington, D.C. pp. 78-79; 1940 Census, Nativity and Parentage of the White Population, Table 2, p. 10; 1950 Census, Vol. IV, Special Reports, Table 13, p. 75; 1950 Census, U.S. Summary, Detailed Characteristics, Table 162, p. 366.

The United States finally recognized the problem in 1923 and passed legislation during the following years to permit these refugees to enter the country. (Housepian, (1966), provides one of the few, although emotional, accounts of the expulsion of Greeks from Smyrna in 1923.)

We unfortunately do not have clear records on the numbers and demographic composition of these refugees. Immigration records combine refugees from Asia Minor with figures on Greeks emigrating from mainland and insular portions of Greece. We do know that from 1921-1934, about 40,000 immigrants from Asia Minor entered the United States. Another 51,084 migrated from Greece (Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1940).

From the recollections of informants who fled from Smyrna or whose parents were refugees, we can recreate some of the difficulties of these refugees in the Greek communities in America. Many of these refugees emigrated as families--not as the male migrants had done before them. Many had been businessmen in Asia Minor, involved in trade, tobacco, rugs, furs, and other commodities, particularly in coastal cities. They were middle-class in background and outlook. Many were more educated than the peasants who preceded them. Many had lived all or most of their lives in urban areas. Few had relatives already in America, but some came with kinsmen and their families.

The tendencies, in some cases, was for these refugees to cluster together, much as the earlier immigrants had done. Many had to accept menial jobs after they first arrived. But their desire to reestablish themselves financially and their skills as entrepreneurs and businessmen often permitted them to open groceries or start small retail operations or import businesses in comparatively short periods of time after their arrival. The commitment of the new refugee to a future life in America and his economic initiative in developing

new business facilitated his involvement in the older community and his integration into the larger cultural framework.

For both the refugee and the immigrant these years were both times of economic prosperity and times of cultural and political pressure. Greeks were enjoying the benefits of America's post-war industrial growth. Yet they were suffering under the pressures of Americanization movements, anti-catholic campaigns, anti-radicalism and eugenic philosophy, and eventually the success of restrictionist lobbyists to close immigration to Greeks and other southern and eastern Europeans. The passage of the Johnson-Reed Act in 1924 and its full implementation in 1929 reduced the immigration of Greeks into the United States to a trickle of its former size. Under the new system, the total number of immigrants admissible annually from countries outside the Western Hemisphere was limited to 150,000. Within this limit, quotas were apportioned to European countries on the basis of 2% of their population in the United States in the 1890 census. Northwest Europe had roughly five times the number of quota immigrants of southern and eastern European countries. Thus, despite the fact that German, Scandinavian and Irish immigration had outnumbered the British during the 1920's by almost three to one, Great Britian was given a quota larger than the totals of all other countries in northwest Europe combined (Jones, 1960).

For the Greek, quota restrictions meant that the thousands of Greeks who replenished the immigrant's links to his homeland would be cut off from America. In the peak of Greek immigration, during the 1900-1920 period, an average of 17,641 emigrated to the United States yearly. In the decade after immigration restrictions were in operation, an average of 911 Greeks entered the country each year. The quota for Greeks was 308. Others came

as non-quota immigrants on special visas. The communities here, small as they were in relation to other immigrant groups, and cut from outside sources of growth, had to seek some way to deal with the problems of nativism, economic competition and demands for cultural conformity, as well as the concerns of families to preserve their ethnic and religious heritage for their children.

The response of Greeks, both immigrant and American-born, to these new conditions were articulated through their voluntary associations and their religious organ, the Greek Orthodox Church. The two voluntary associations which emerged at this time, the American Hellenic Educational Program Association (AHEPA), and the Greek American Progressive Association (GAPA), grew to dominate Greek community life through the Second World War and into the post-war decades. The Greek Orthodox Church, rife with internal conflict and schismatic churches, was not to gain public recognition as a major religious institution in America until the 1960's, and then only after years of struggle with rivals from within and without the Church hierarchy.

The contrast in the development and orientations of the AHEPA and the GAPA provides some sense of the different approaches Greek's pursued to deal with the demands of the larger American society and their own interests and goals as Greeks in America. The AHEPA was formed in 1922; the GAPA, the following year. The AHEPA was a response among Greek businessmen in Atlanta, Georgia to the growing anti-foreignism and active Klu Klux Klan hostilities during the highly volatile post-war decade. The GAPA was born as a reactionary response to the progressivism of the AHEPA.

According to AHEPA history the organization was formed by George Nicholopoulos and John Angelopoulos, two salesmen living in Atlanta. Their intent was to cope with nativist hostility by fostering a unity among Greeks,

inculcating in the immigrant and the Greek-American an aggressive nationalism. The AHEPA was to educate the Greek, particularly the businessman, the professional and the aspiring politicians, in the principles and life styles of American society. The association was secretive. An applicant for membership had to be a citizen of the United States or eligible to become one. He had to be Caucasian and a believer in the divinity of Christ. Special appeals were held out to distinguished non-Greeks to become members. According to its official publication, The Ahepa, the club's membership stemmed from "a variety of racial stocks including descendants of Mayflower genealogy, but the majority are of Greek birth or American born of Greek descent" (The Order of AHEPA, 1922-1961).

From its inception the organization was middle class in orientation. Its annual meetings attracted governors and judges, lawyers and politicians, both Greek and non-Greek, to speak on widely ranging subjects, most of which preached on the importance of the immigrant to America. AHEPA, by representing Americanism in a decade of nativist conformity, offered Greeks prestige, power and social recognition in a setting in which they were comfortable. The secretive nature of the association conveyed an element of select importance to those who, in their upward mobility, craved it. The dances, banquets, and eventually the ladies and childrens auxiliaries offered Greeks appropriate opportunities in which to socialize, indoctrinate their children in the importance of maintaining Hellenic ties within an American context, and facilitate the future transmission of Greek culture. Yet, this was all done within a framework oriented towards a future life in America. The organization grew rapidly as it skillfully combined the values of Americanization with the traditions of Hellenism.

To some Greeks the organization was supposed to promote an Hellenic renaissance in America, marked by Hellenic artistic and civic supremacy. To others, it was an analog to the freemasons and would bind Greeks together all over the world. Still other Greeks, particularly those involved in the Greek Orthodox Church, wanted the organization to affiliate with the church, much as the Knights of Columbus did with the Catholic church. But AHEPA remained autonomous and non-sectarian. Its leaders were denounced by outsiders as psuedo-patriots and opportunists. Critics claimed that it misrepresented everything worthy among Greeks in America. Some criticized anti-Hellenic features in the organization's programs and policies. Many Greeks were particularly concerned that the organization would eliminate the use of Greek among the children of its members by refusing to permit Greek to be spoken in its official meetings. To members of the organization, English represented an avenue into American life, and an end to the endless appeals among its members and outsiders for the preservation of Greek culture and patriotism (Salutos, 1964).

Those who objected to AHEPA and its policies organized themselves into a rival association--the Greek American Progressive Assocation. In December, 1923, a group of Greeks met in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania to form an organization to protect the legacy of Hellenism. The GAPA's philosophy was romantic, idealistic and strongly linked to the glory of ancient Greece, to the preservation of the Greek language, and to the purity of ancient Greek Orthodoxy. Its supporters were, by and large, from working class segments of the community. More affluent Greeks were not attracted to the organization, and it ultimately suffered from the lack of middle class leadership. It attracted the rank and file workers who seemed most insecure in America, and hence, most attached to their homeland and most willing to seek prestige in a milieu in which they

were comfortable.

AHEPA's membership grew rapidly during the years after its creation. By 1924 it already had 40 chapters and a membership of 2,800. In 1928 this had increased to 192 chapters with 17,516 members. By the mid-1950's, as we shall discuss later, the organization claimed that it had initiated more than 72,000 members and that the total membership exceeded 90,000 (What is the AHEPA, 1956). In 1928, the GAPA also claimed more than 50 chapters, but its subsequent popularity was never to reach the heights of the AHEPA. Its adherence to its original philosophy alienated the young, American-born Greek, leaving its chapters with aging rosters and without replenishment from the young. The best it offered for its members was a social outlet. It was a nation-wide, nationality organization without major influence in American life. AHEPA, on the other hand, gradually grew to major importance as a spokesman for Greeks and a lobby for Greek interests in the United States.

D. Community Building and the Greek Orthodox Church

While the needs of the early all male communities were partially met by regional associations, and the problems of assimilation and incapsulation in later communities were tackled by national organizations such as AHEPA and GAPA, the problems of life and death, marriage and divorce, Easter and Christmas, were assumed by the Greek Orthodox Church. The Greek Orthodox Church in Greece was aware of the spiritual needs of its members in America. Its efforts to control these immigrants proved a more complicated problem. America presented an unusual framework within which the Orthodox Church had to operate. In Greece, ethnic and religious identities, national and religious institutions were inseparable. To be born a Greek meant that you were born

into the Greek Orthodox Church. The religion itself was a syncretism between early pagan belief systems and later Christian beliefs and practices. The continuity between ancient traditions and Christian doctrine was reinforced by the position of the Church during the Byzantine control of the country. The church and its leaders served as political authorities representing Greeks during the Byzantine Empire and continued as such under Turkish occupation. Greeks could not conceptualize a functional separation between church and state. In modern Greece, the church is administered within the governmental structure as part of the Ministry of Education and Religion. The salaries of the clergy are dispensed by the state, and religious belief is part of national patriotism (Sanders, 1962).

With such a strong conceptual and institutional connection between religion, politics, church and state, the isolation of national identity from religious beliefs and affiliations in America was a difficult problem with which the Greek Orthodox Church had to contend. Religious institutions in America were legally separated from the secular state. Individuals could voluntarily select which, if any, church they wished to attend. Evangelism was accepted as part of the natural competition between religious beliefs. Church support no longer came from state taxes. If the Greek Orthodox Church was to establish itself in America, a complete reassessment of its structure was needed. New policies and programs had to replace the older ones. Yet, there was little consensus within the church hierarchy or in Greek communities over how to reach a new institutional order.

During the early period of Greek immigrant settlement, the immigrant had few priests and no established church. Immigrants settling in small towns often joined Episcopalian churches or other Protestant denominations (Warner

and Srole, 1945). The Russian Orthodox Church attempted to attract Greeks and act as their spokesman in America. Competition for control of the Greeks was intense.

The first Greek Orthodox churches were established not by clergy but by concerned laymen. In New York City, for example, a group of about five hundred Greeks met in 1892 to organize the Society of Athena, which, among other things, was to secure a priest and establish a church for the community. The leader of the organization was Solon Vlasto, the future publisher of the major Greek newspaper, the Atlantis. As soon as sufficient pledges were collected, the society arranged to construct a church. The Holy Synod of Greece was asked to send a priest. Shortly after he arrived, however, association members decided to separate the administration of the church from the Society of Athena over a dispute with the priest. The aggrieved faction attempted to set up another church, appealing to the Ecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople for an "educated priest." The Patriarch, unaware of what was occurring in New York, sent over another priest to serve in the new parish of Annunciation in New York (Salutos, 1964).

The difficulties in this particular church were typical of the forces fragmenting religious communities throughout the United States. Two problems repeatedly arose. The first had to do with the relative power of lay members and clergy in the administration of the church, both in its secular and spiritual spheres. The second concerned the relative power of the Ecumenical Patriarch in Constantinople and the Patriarch of Greece in Athens over the Greeks in America.

The rivalry between the two Patriarchs needs consideration first since it often served to split lay and clergy in America over matters essentially of

internal concern to the church community. The difficulties between the two Patriarchs stemmed from a long history of conflict between Athens and Constantinople. During Turkish control of Greece, the church was ruled from Constantinople. In the mid-nineteenth century, the Church of Greece separated from the Ecumenical Patriarch and established itself as a separate sovereign, ruling Orthodox followers on the Greek mainland. Constantinople continued to control Greeks living in Asia Minor and in other parts of the world.

For Greeks in America, the division between these two seats of power had several effects. During the early 1900's, the first Greek churches in America were considered, by Constantinople, to be part of the diaspora and hence under its dominion. Greece regarded these immigrants and their churches as merely Greeks living away from their mainland families. Remittances from Greek immigrants in America to Greece were substantial. Many Greeks returned regularly to visit their families and villages. The immigrants did not consider themselves colonists living under foreign domination, but migrants temporarily working outside of Greece. Those who sought to permanently resettle in America considered adopting it as a new homeland. They were not Greeks living in exile. For the Patriarchs, traditional concepts of ethnarch control over diaspora Greeks was inappropriate to this particular situation, and yet no new political framework existed.

After much conflict, the question of jurisdiction was temporarily resolved in 1908 when the Church of Greece assumed control over Greeks in the New World. Subsequent political divisions within Greece between royalist supporters of King Constantine and liberal proponents of Eleutherios Venizelos later split the state Church into two rival factions, incapacitating the church's ability to rule. Constantinople capitalized on the fragmentation in Greece

to resume control over America's Greeks in 1922. This is not to suggest that all Greeks in America recognized the jurisdiction of one or the other ethnarch (The New York Times, October 16, 1917; June 7, 1971).

These political conflicts in Greece served as rallying points around which factions within Greek Orthodox churches in America coalesced. Laity first attempted to impose its political sympathies upon the affiliation and orientation of the clergy and the church hierarchy. Priests were hired and dismissed on the basis of their political support of Venizelos or royalist King Constantine. New churches were built and others abandoned, half constructed, as new bishops were appointed or new supervisory lay boards asserted their power. As Vlachos (1968) writes:

> A factionalism and sectionalism starting from Greece and intensified by the political rift between royalists and liberals came to full force with the dispute over church authority. The Greek community started having two churches, two coffee houses, two societies, and the lines between the opposite camps were rarely crossed.

The case of the Lowell, Massachusetts church serves as one illustration of the effects of these conflicts, emanating from Greece, on America's immigrant communities. Lowell was considered the capital of Greek royalism in America during these decades. In 1923, the board of trustees of the Holy Trinity Church in Lowell attempted to form a separate, autocephalus church in the United States, comparable to the national churches of Russia and Rumania. The Orthodox Church in America, under Lowell's control, was to operate without interference from either Greece or Constantinople. The response of the American Archbishop Alexander and the Patriarch Metaxas in Constantinople was one of outrage. The canons of the church and past traditions legitimated the claims of Lowell's leaders to create an autocephalus, national church. Historically, since Roman times, schismatic and National churches repeatedly

established their independence from centers of religious power to provide local populations control over their religious organizations (Benz, 1957). But, the competition for control over this growing and potentially important population of Greeks became politically essential to the future power of these two Patriarchs. When Bishop Germanos, the spiritual leader of the Lowell community and political rival of Alexander left for Greece, the community and its autocephalus church fell into internal dissension and public disrepute. Rival schisms within the church challenged its actions in Massachusetts courts and won a decision depriving the rebellious faction of control over local church properties. In the end, the leaders of the autocephalus movement lost support and turned the supervisory board back over to the Venizelos faction.

Despite the limited success and ultimate failure of this particular rebellion, others like it were repeated in major Greek communities throughout the country. The appearance in 1923 of Metropolitan Vasileos Komvopoulos from Greece to head a rebellious royalist faction in Chicago again met with great success. It was duplicated again in New York and in Boston as the Metropolitan proselytized his political appeal for independence from Constantinople and Athens.

Salutos (1964) suggests that supporters of these royalist groups generally came from the lower classes and the newer peasant immigrants. The more upwardly mobile members of the business community and the growing middle classes in Greek enclaves tended to support the canonical church and the Archdiocese under Alexander.

Alexander's control over the church collapsed by the late 1920's after he attempted to sever the American church's ties with Athens, establishing himself as the new Ethnarch. In June, 1930, Alexander was removed from

office and replaced by Greek-born Acthenagoras. The task of the new leader was to revitalize Greek orthodoxy and the Greek language in a population of Greek Americans growing increasingly independent, comfortable, and committed to future lives in America. His efforts were not to silence dissent, but to generate still further conflict and fragmentation in the decades following.

The Greek immigrant's concern with his church and with the politics surrounding its spiritual functions were not simply the results of political turmoil in the homeland. The church traditionally provided a focus for community life in the Greek village. The village priest was both a necessary participant in major points of life passage, christenings, namedays,marriages, the construction of a new home, and Sunday morning mass. "In Greece, when a priest is missing it is a great calamity, for the Greek is not used to praying by himself without a priest" (Sanders, 1962). In the earlier days, when superstition dominated social life, the priest, as the minister of God, alone had power over the vampires and the evil eye. At the same time, the priest was also a figure of ridicule and of ill omen. An encounter with the priest was supposed to bring bad luck. If a peasant began a new venture and met a priest, he would return home to avoid failure. In the local village, the priest was usually a married man who worked his fields much as his neighbors did, yet who also had greater spiritual sources of power than his neighbors. Hence, there was much ambivalence towards the priest and towards his religion (Sanders, 1962; Lee, 1953; Blum and Blum, 1970).

The church and its rituals permeated Greek life. The Sunday morning service served as the woman's social hour, attracting few men. Men, on the other hand, sat on the church board, with the priest as its president. The board was responsible for the financial operations of the church building and for the

sale of candles in the church vestibule to support church operations. Much of the yearly cycle in peasant life was guided by the holy days and ceremonies of the religious cycle. There were holy days when master and servants were supposed to draw up the contract between them, when the wine cask was to be opened, when the icons were dipped into the sea. There were also saints' days and namedays which were celebrated with feasting and visiting. Christmas and Easter and the days preceding them were traditionally periods of fasting, and then celebration, caroling and fireworks. These were times of both solemn processions and joyous levity.

The Greek immigrant viewed his church and its rituals as more than a set of spiritual beliefs. It held together the Greek's year and his life, and linked him through ceremonies and beliefs to his traditions and his ancestors. In America, it consequently offered one of the few symbolic links to his homeland and to other Greeks who shared the same ancestors and ancestry. The priest, despite his traditionally ambiguous position in village life, remained the carrier of this ancestry. He could sanction life rites and legitimate social celebrations with proper rituals.

During these early years, however, and despite the fundamental place of the church in the Greek villager's life, the continuous political turmoil in local and national church organizations left many of the American-born generation uncertain about their future affiliation with the Orthodox Church. The persistent emphasis within church teachings of Orthodoxy's supremacy over other religions and the cultural superiority of the Hellenic tradition over all others stood in direct opposition to the teachings in the public schools that Greeks and other immigrants had to accept American traditions as superior, or at least equal to all others. While the church remained a repository of

Greek values, it was also a conservative force retarding Greek immigrant integration into the larger American society. With time, many Greeks remained outside formal affiliation with the Orthodox Church. Others insisted on the introduction of English into the Mass, which was not to occur until the 1960's. Still others became token members, affiliating but not participating in the church (Salutos, 1964).

Immigration: Period II, the Post War Years

By the advent of the Great Depression, Greek communities in America had reached a turning point in their development. Nineteen twenty nine marked the beginning of quota restrictions on Greek immigration to America. Annual Greek immigration was reduced to 308. In the ten years following this limitation only 9,119 Greeks immigrated to the United States. From 1941-1950 only 8,973 Greeks immigrated, aside from those admitted under special refugee legislation. Compared to the hundreds of thousands of Greeks settling in America in the decades preceding these quota regulations, Greek migration was reduced to a trickle. The impact on Greek communities here was dramatic. Immigrants had to contend with the reality that they could no longer return to Greece nor bring to America wives, families, friends and fellow villagers. The vitality to their communities could no longer be sustained links to their past. Pressure from groups advocating national conformity in America were intense. Divisions over how to deal with these pressures made decision-making difficult. Concern with royalism and democracy in Greece subsided as parents struggled with the education of their children and the economic difficulties of the depression decade. The few Greeks who did immigrate into the country usually had relatives here who could help them find housing and jobs. Communities were hardly dented by these immigrants. Most immigrants were

absorbed into the larger communities.

The challenges of the war years and the problems of post-war refugees from Greece, however, set Greek communities into motion again. Greece faced major devastation after the Second World War. Starvation and economic stagnation was widespread and all-consuming. The more immediate problem, however, was the presence of Communist guerillas challenging royalist efforts to reestablish political authority along monarchist models. For many Greeks in the mountainous regions of Epirus and Macedonia, and in devastated urban centers, the only solution was to migrate. Villagers from some of these areas recall that the conditions were those of bare subsistance. Greeks who refused to supply Communist bands with food were often found dead. Villages that refused to harbor Communist insurgents were burned. In some instances, as Communist positions began to deteriorate, guerillas attempted to conscript women for labor or kidnap children for indoctrination in Russia or Albania. In an effort to choke Communist supply lines, government forces relocated villagers to government-controlled southern cities and coastal regions (Personal Communication; Gage, 1971).

The United States force-fed military and economic aid into the Greek economy to bolster its armed forces and stabilize its production and marketing structures. Sentiment in Greek communities in America towards these programs was divided. While private efforts to help stabilize conditions in Greece, rebuild hospitals and schools and assist in the redevelopment of the farm economy, were willingly directed to the Greek War Relief Association, Greek spokesmen were publicly opposed to the Truman Doctrine. Sentiment in Congress for Greek military and economic assistance was so overwhelming that Greek-American communities and organizations were not considered in Congressional decisions.

The two Greek-Americans who were asked to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee expressed disapproval of American support of royalists or rightist governments in Greece. The various Greek language newspapers similarly tended to oppose assistance to the undemocratic policy of the monarchists. The general Greek-American public, however, seemed less concerned over aid programs than over the plight of their relatives in Greece. Active Greek agitation in America began only when immigration legislation was pending in Congress.

One part of Truman's post-war aid program was a proposal to provide asylum for refugees from the political uprisings in Greece. Despite the fact that these were refugees from Communism--a condition popular in America at that time--and despite America's traditional support of asylum for refugees, passage of Truman's refugee bills met with extensive opposition. Truman argued that it was in America's best interests to aid the recovery of Europe by assuming responsibility for these displaced persons. Opponents to these measures, mainly from rural southern and midwestern regions, were concerned with the impact of immigrants on the political dominance of the north. A number of veteran organizations and patriotic associations similarly opposed refugee legislation which would deprive returning veterans of jobs and housing while permitting undesirables and subversives into the country (Jones, 1960). Greek efforts to expedite the passage of these bills attests to the growing influence of individual and organized Greeks in America. AHEPA was particularly energetic in its lobbying efforts. AHEPA representatives appeared before legislative committees to emphasize the plight of Greeks from the poverty of the homeland.

Despite extensive opposition, six special refugee bills were passed between 1948 and 1960. Under these programs, 29,156 Greek refugees entered

the United States between 1948-1964 (U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Report, June, 1965). Special legislation in 1954 permitted the allotment of special non-quota visas to refugees or relatives. (Table IV shows the numbers arriving in the United States from 1931-1970).

We know very little about the backgrounds of these refugees. Unlike the all male immigrant populations from the early pioneer period, these refugees had a population with an almost equal sex ratio. Many refugees seemed to come as familial units. Others had relatives here to sponsor and assist them. In 1959, for example, at the peak of refugee migration, the sex ration was 2,177 males to 2,336 females, or 93%. In contrast, the sex ratio for 1902 was 7,867 males to 237 females or 3.19% (Vlachos, 1968). Those immigrants designated as displaced persons were generally older persons. Refugees were, by and large, younger individuals. They were still filled with the idea that, in America, they could easily find jobs, work hard, and fulfill the myth of economic success. While the older displaced persons discovered that they often shared little with their relatives who had long been part of America, the refugees discovered that rapid success was elusive without years of hard work and patience. Some, such as one informant, Elios Betzios, found success (his life history is in the Appendix, No. 1). Others attempted to share the wealth of their relatives. In their demands for familial responsibility they found relatives rejecting them and families disintegrating under the pressures of incorporating these newcomers. Tensions accelerated as the newly arrived Greeks attempted to dominate older communities on the theory that they were more Greek than their Americanized compatriots. They believed they were more able and worthy of power and prestige in these communities. The older immigrants who had long toiled in America, often only to see the success of their children, condemned the refugees for

Table IV

Number of Greek Immigrants
by Decades 1931 - 1970

Years	Number
1931 - 40	9,119
1941 - 50	8,973
1951 - 60	47,608
1961 - 70	85,954

Greek Immigration to the United States
by year 1961 - 1972

1961	3,124
1962	4,408
1963	4,744
1964	3,998
1965	3,016
1966	8,221
1967	14,194
1968	12,185
1969	16,634
1970	15,430
1971	15,002
1972	10,452

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1931 - 1940.

their arrogant and contemptuous behavior. Some of the newcomers suffered at the hands of exploitative relatives and were justified in their distress. Others simply did not comprehend the changes which had occurred to the older immigrants and to the Greek-American.

For the Greek community as a whole, the influx served several purposes. The circulation of almost defunct Greek language papers increased. Greek cultural life--tavernas, bouzoukis, dancing and Greek foods--found new customers and hence a new vitality. Greek-American professionals, doctors and lawyers in particular, discovered new clients. Steamship companies attracted new customers. And, Greek Orthodox Churches were filled with new and dedicated adherents (Salutos, 1964).

Organizational life during the post-war decade continued, invigorated by the influx of refugees. Primarily Greek-oriented associations began to dwindle in numbers and importance, however, as even the refugees discovered independent avenues to economic success and American approaches to prestige. The GAPA and numerous other regional and local societies continued to appeal primarily to members of the pioneer and pre-war immigrant generations. Many of these Greeks, while growing older in America, tended to remain enclaved in Greek communities, minimizing their external contacts and seeking friends and social life within Greek organizations. The organization's interests in charitable, educational and religious concerns primarily in Greece continued as the principle foci of group activities. GAPA's own rigidity adhering to its original program eventually led to its demise as a significant spokesman for Greeks, or even as a viable associational sphere for older Greek immigrants (Salutos, 1964).

AHEPA, on the other hand, under the leadership of upwardly mobile

Greeks and Greek-Americans remained the most influental of lay organizations. Its programs and philosophies began to change. A compromise was slowly reached between its original anti-Hellenism and a more moderate position capable of welding traditional Hellenic ideals with pragmatic programs. Its charity programs were primarily designed to develop schools and hospitals in America, to assist higher education among the Greeks, and, when necessary, to supply funds for victims of floods and earthquakes in both the United States and in Greece (Salutos, 1964). Through its women's auxiliary, The Daughters of Penelope and its youth organizations, The Sons of Pericles and The Maids of Athens, it attracted the continued support of the young American-born Greek, and fostered a sense of community and Greek identity among children who otherwise resembled many of their non-Greek contemporaries. For aspiring young professionals, stock brokers, politicians and even restauranteers, the local chapters provided meeting places and social centers for cultivating business contacts. On the national level, the organization continued to lobby for legislation important to Greeks in different parts of the country or crucial to Greece itself. National leaders of the organization often used it to catapult themselves into prominence with national political organizations. Despite the utilitarian manipulation of the organization, it represented for the Greek public one avenue for articulating Greek needs and opinions without compromising individual cultural integration into the larger American society.

The status of the Greek Orthodox Church, locally and nationally, was also changing during the 1950's and early 1960's. Conflict still characterized its organizational structure, but it gradually gained in prestige and national prominence as a major religion in this country. Exposure and experience in America had taught many Greeks that they were free to choose a church and

guide its operations--both secular and spiritual—through democratic procedures. Whether Greeks belonged to a church, were active members in one, or were non-observers, they nonetheless continued to expound on dogma, disregard decisions of superordinates, overrule local priests, and direct the operations of church properties and programs. Archdiocesan efforts to cure the friction arising over this individual sense of independence through centralization misjudged the source of the illness. Part of the centralization program attempted to systematize the assignment of priests, regularize and enlarge the revenues of the Archdiocese, and enforce the Uniform Parish By-Laws established for all local communities. Greeks and particularly the growing numbers of Greek-Americans participating in local churches resented the tactics of the Archdiocese to impose these decisions. Supposed threats to rebellious lay leaders or the defrocking of uncooperative priests generated serious debate within local communities over the intent of the Archbishop. Was he seeking abusive power for the Archdiocese or was he seeking better working relationships with local churches (Kourides, 1959)?

Part of the conflict between local and national administrative structures stemmed from the fact that few in the higher levels of church government were trained or born in the West. Bishops were usually brought over from Greece or other parts of the Mediterranean. Local-level priests, on the other hand, were, in increasing numbers, American-born or at least forced to respond to the interests and attitudes of more Western-oriented local parishoners. The local communities were interested in securing democratic control over their church communities. As late as 1950, Chicago's eleven Greek Orthodox Churches remained separate corporations loosely affiliated to the Archdiocese. The Archdiocese had only indirect authority over their parishes and primarily on

religious considerations (Yeracaris, 1950). (This was also the period when St. Markela was formed in Astoria.)

Archdiocesan administrators sought to centralize decision-making at upper levels, emasculating local priests and laity in the process. One particular instance where this conflict of interests surfaced was the authoritarian imposition of a tax on church members by the Archdiocese in 1943. For parishioners, the imposition of the "monodollarian" or single dollar tax, was viewed as an unnecessary, illegitimate imposition by the Archbishop without due consideration of the attitudes of individual parishioners. Some parishes resisted the tax, even after it was increased to ten dollars in 1950. Others permitted parishioners to voluntarily contribute the tax to church fund raisers. Nevertheless, the amount of revenue generated by the tax was never adequate to support the Archdiocese. Nor did it indicate complete compliance by all members of the church community. It should be noted that the monodollarian contribution was still inadequate to cover operating expenses. Periodic fund raising drives were necessary to raise supplementary income for the church. The case is the same today where private contributions continue to supplement church membership fees to sustain Archdioceses and local church operations (Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, Tenth Biennial Congress of Clergymen and Laity, 1950; Orthodox Observer, December 17, 1942, April 4, 1973).

The inability of the church to solve these problems of administration and orientation weakened its ability to cope with the growing problems of Greek-Americans in the early post-World War II period. The internal conflicts were further complicated by the influx of Greek refugees from the Second World War and from the Greek civil war. While the new Greek refugees began to

revive Hellenism in many Greek-American communities, American-born Greeks were seeking major modifications in the church to move it away from Hellenism. Confrontations occurred on three planes--between American-born children and their parents, between new refugees and older immigrants, and between upwardly mobile Greeks, regardless of generation, and those less economically successful. While the Archdiocese attempted to establish the Greek Orthodox Church as a major religion, on a par with Roman Catholicism, Protestantism and Judaism in America, local parishes faced internal dissension among those struggling to Americanize their churches and church programs and those seeking to increase the use of the Greek language and retain a sense of traditional Orthodox rituals in the religious programs. Once again one of the results of stratification of communities along diverging lines of personal interests was the fragmentation of church communities and the formation of schismatic sects. The other result was the modification of church buildings, liturgies and institutional structures to coincide with the needs and interests of different segments of these church communities.

For American-born Greeks and for the upwardly mobile immigrant the general strategy pursued was one of revamping the older Orthodox Church or the construction of new ones. Often this coincided with the establishment of new Greek communities in suburban areas outside the early settlement sites of the immigrant. In most cases, these Greek-American and Greek immigrants transformed their churches in ways which hardly resembled the Byzantine designs and traditional rituals of original Orthodox churches in America.

Not only were church buildings redesigned, but the basic question of which language to use in church services began in increase in importance. For many Greek-Americans, the language of the church ceremonies was alien to

their ears. Most could barely understand the ancient Greek much less speak modern Greek. The ritual was becoming meaningless to them. As one woman wrote of the problem in The Orthodox Observer (April 4, 1973),

> ...At least 98% of the children, many the products of mixed marriages do not understand the Greek language. They are a bright group of youngsters who want to understand. There is no lack of enthusiasm as they enter the church, but as I watch them trying desperately to follow in their liturgy translation books, only to find that one or two special hymns have been added, and they are lost again, I see frustration setting in on their little faces as they look back to me completely bewildered.

Efforts by the Archdiocese to permit liturgies to be said in English simply generated further controversy. Some churches had already begun to implement English rituals. Others rejected any transition from Greek to English. (Any review of Letters to the Editor in the Orthodox Observer or the Hellenic Chronical reveals the intensity with which this issue continues to dominate Orthodoxy. Similar conflicts arise in most local parish discussions over how much of each language should be taught in the day schools.)

The church administration attempted to reduce criticism from other denominations that it was an alien religion, still linked to Greece, controlled by foreigners and unresponsive to the needs of American Greeks. In an effort to establish itself as a respectable denomination, the church began to train English-speaking, American-born priests and to encourage its priests to participate in civic, philanthropic and educational causes in local communities. Parishioners themselves were ambivalent towards this new role for the priest. Pastoral and spiritual concerns seemed to become decreasingly important as public interests and personal prestige assumed primary consideration. Criticisms of the church hierarchy and the priesthood intensified as a result. The Archdiocese was condemned for pursuing insensitive policies in communities

where parishioners disagreed with the Archbishop. The levying of the per-capita tax was particularly appalling and materialistic to some Greeks. American-born priests found it difficult to understand many of the attitudes of their Greek-born bishops and even their Greek-born parishioners. The authoritarianism of the church hierarchy was complicated by the individualism of the church membership leaving the priest in the unpleasant position of having to satisfy two totally diverging positions.

The church attempted to reduce some of these tensions through the Lay-Clergy Congress. By granting laymen some power in administrative decisions, the church attempted to offset demands on the local levels for increased lay control. Most Congresses were condemned as priest-dominated. The authoritarianism of the Archdiocese did not diminish with this facade of democracy, and most Greeks recognized the fact that powerful laymen were often the pawns of the clerical machinery (Salutos, 1964). The conflicts have not abated to this day. Yet the church has established itself more firmly as a significant religious denomination in America and lay leaders in local churches have gained slowly in their own control over church operations.

Period of the "New" Immigration, 1965-1972

The most recent, large-scale migration of Greeks to the United States, the period popularly termed the "New" migration, awaited major revisions in United States immigration policies during the Kennedy-Johnson era. There were several factors in America influencing Congressional action on immigration legislation and ultimately resulting in dramatic modifications of earlier migration policies. Perhaps the overarching liberalism of the decade as well as the practical demands of a rapidly expanding economy created an atmosphere

receptive to relaxations in quota regulations. This was also a decade of growing tolerance for ethnic diversity in America, and with this, a demand by ethnic Americans to rejuvenate their communities with relatives and cultural compatriots from the old world (Schrag, 1970; Novak, 1972; Levine, Herman and Seifer, 1973; Glazer and Moynihan, 1974; Greeley, 1974).

Congressional action finally came in 1965 with the passage of the Immigration Act of 1965. For the Greeks the new bill permitted a maximum of 20,000 immigrants annually, exclusive of parents, spouses and children of U.S. citizens. Despite the passage of this legislation, the encouragement of kinsmen and the attractions of an expanding economy, the question of why Greeks would once again flock to America is subject to much controversy. The period from the end of Communist-Royalist hostilities in Greece to the military coup in 1967 was one of a gradual upturn in the country's economic productivity, industrial growth and educational reform programs. Agriculture was being reorganized, urban centers were overhauled. Living conditions, both rural and urban, were visibly improved, and apparently continued to modernize (Myrick and Witucki, 1971; Clogg and Yannopoulos, 1972). Several factors, however, continued to generate out-migration by Greeks. The most critical of these was the persistence of small, fragmented farms along side unproductive large estates. This was compounded by the labor policies and political repressions of the military government after 1967.

From 1947-1967 Greece's agricultural output increased at a compound annual rate of 4.9%. The proportion of land irrigated increased from 7% to 17%. Crop output grew 4.4% per year and livestock production increased 6.6%. Urban expansion, and particularly the urbanites' demand for beef, eggs, and milk, as well as for fresh produce, further stimulated the production of cash

crops, and dairy and meat products. Improved roads and communication systems facilitated the flow of these goods from outlying districts into urban markets, generating, to some extent, improved standards of living for both rural and urban sectors (Myrick and Witucki, 1971).

Despite this expansion of agricultural productivity, the persistance of small landholdings frustrated government efforts to increase farm incomes and production efficiencies. Although the Constitution of 1952 limited land holdings to a maximum of 300 stremmas, some farms remained larger than the limit. The average size of farms had changed little after the war. Farms averaged 8 acres or 36.7 stremmas. In 1961 80% of the farmers had less than 50 stremmas, yet these occupied 50% of all the agricultural land. Such small fragmented units precluded the efficient use of machinery and decreased the productivity of labor units (Myrick and Witucki, 1971). Land remained scarce while dowry and inheritance practices continued to fragment it. Non-agricultural employment was limited. Efforts to consolidate land holdings into collectives or to redistribute large estates to smaller peasants were frustrated by the social values and economic interests of large and small landholders alike.

The birth rate during these years fortunately remained low (0.8% from 1947-1967). In rural areas, there still existed a burdensome overpopulation. There was an oversupply of untrained agricultural labor. Industrial expansion and manufacturing service and commercial sectors of the economy grew slowly. By the mid-1960's these sectors were still unable to absorb the excess labor force.

While many of those landless laborers driven from the countryside resettled in Greece's cities, most were no better off economically than they were in their rural homesteads. From 1960-1965, 100,000 people migrated

to Greek cities from the countryside annually. The main areas of this migration were Epirus, Macedonia and Thrace, the areas most severely affected by both fragmented lands and limited irrigation. Economic expansion in west European industrial centers, however, was beginning to attract migrant workers from Greece after the mid-1950's. West Germany, France and northern Italy were particularly labor poor. From 1955-1966, 750,000 Greeks emigrated to Europe. Seventy percent of these went to West Germany. Two-fifths were farmers, farm laborers, laborers, or craftsmen. After 1960, 80% were in the 15-44 age bracket (Myrick and Witucki, 1971). Myrick and Witucki (1971), for example, suggest that as revenues from Greek immigrant workers in Western Europe began to pour into Greece (from 1964-1966, 559 million dollars flowed into Greece from migrants in Europe) business and foreign investors seized upon the stability of the military dictatorship to expand industries, and as the government developed public works projects, the Greek economy continued to expand, increasing its rate of growth. In 1968, the GNP rose only 4% over the preceding year. In 1970, it rose 7.1% over 1969. Manufacturing output increased 10.3% in the first nine months of 1970. Agricultural production increased 7.5% over 1969. The average level of consumer prices rose only 3.1% compared with the preceding year, the lowest rate of increase among all other European countries. Inflation, on the other hand, was up 15%, with only a 9% increase in industrial wages. Unemployment was so low that the government began to look into ways to reverse the low birth rates and high emigration rates which had characterized Greece's demographic picture since the end of the Second World War (The New York Times, January 13, 1969). Various industrial interest groups were also urging the government to lift bans on the importation of Middle Eastern and North African workers. The Association of Greek Textile Manufacturers

officially requested the government to lift the immigration ban so they could import Pakistani workers to run Greek textile plants. A similar shortage of Greek seamen led merchant shippers to use Asians and Arabs as crewmen, often paying them lower salaries than even the Greek seamen had received (Yannopoulos, 1972).

Those who opposed the Greek military regime acknowledge that the Greek economy continued to expand after the 1967 coup. The rate of expansion, they argued, was slower. Further, specific policies of the government jeopardized the security and economic position of certain sectors of the society --students, workers, and agricultural peasants, in particular -- for the sake of improving profits and power of other sectors, namely the property and capital interest groups. According to statistics (Greek National Statistics Service, 1971), the estimated active population in 1971 was 3,732,468. As of 1971, over half of Greece's working population was still employed in agriculture. Approximately 35.1% or roughly one-third worked in industry, services or public administration. Manual workers employed in manufacturing formed 12.8% of the work force. The rest of the population, 12.5% of the work force, were industrialists, craftsmen, shopkeepers, merchants, managers and professionals. Arguments against the regime cite the fact that while income from profits and rents increased at accelerating rates of growth (4% from 1966-67; 9% from 1967-68; and 15% from 1968-69), income for wage earners was increasing, but at a much slower pace. Relative income positions were consequently widening, intensifying the gulf between rich and poor. Annual increases of money for wage earnings per employee were between seven and eight percent when rising employment rates were taken into account (Yannopoulos, 1972).

For both worker and farmer alike, the most oppressive actions of the

military regime were not reflected in inequities between wages and profits. Rather, the government's efforts to restrict, persecute, reorganize, and if possible, totally eliminate labor unions and agricultural cooperatives threatened the future ability of workers and farmers to improve working conditions and economic positions. In an effort to weaken organized labor, the military government ousted elected union officials and permitted employers to fire workers who supported politically undesirable union officials or who tried to set up independent unions. Fired workers were denied compensation rights. Collective bargaining positions of unions were legally weakened. Supplementary sources of income for civil servants and employees of public corporations were discontinued and employees were forced to work overtime without compensation (Yannopoulous, 1972).

In agriculture, similar programs were instituted to reduce the competitive stature of small farmers on the open market and limit the power of agricultural cooperatives to negotiate for better prices, price supports and social security protections. The military government originally tried to cast itself as protector of the peasant. Agricultural debts were cancelled and public works projects were initiated in rural areas. Both policies had high visibility but little real effect on the agricultural system. The antiquated land tenure structure required vast infusions of creative, long term governmental programs to revitalize it and provide a decent standard of living for the majority of the Greek population. Instead, the government not only restricted the power of cooperatives but virtually eliminated competition by granting exclusive buying rights to large, monopolistic corporations. Tom Pappas, for example, the Greek-American millionaire, had an exclusive purchasing right over all tomatoes grown in western Greece. Such programs granted decisive advantages to middlemen

at the expense of the agricultural producer. The result was that the agricultural population and growth in the agricultural economy were stagnating. The decline of 1% per year in the size of the agricultural population was barely noticed in the rural countryside. Wages in the agricultural sector in 1967-1968 declined by 7%. Neither the rate of increase in subsequent years nor the living standards of agricultural sectors of the economy approached that of urban workers or property and capital holders.

Consequently, while agricultural production was increasing, income from agricultural producers was not increasing at a pace commensurate with their productivity or with the wage earnings of urban workers. Urban workers, in turn, were not keeping pace with the growth in corporate profits or the incomes of property holders. Between 1967-1970, 200,000 Greeks emigrated. Only half that many new jobs had been created in the urban employment market. Increasingly felt labor shortages reflected less a rise in employment than a drain on Greek manpower through emigration.

Conditions in America during the mid-1960's were also changing from restrictive immigration policies to more liberalized regulations. Economically, conditions in the United States during the 1960's were expanding. Unemployment was averaging 3.8% nationwide in 1965 and 3.7% in 1966. Particular sections of the country were critically short on skilled labor. Toledo, for example, was actively encouraging the resettlement of workers there (The New York Times, January 7, 1968). A 1966 publication of the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Commission listed occupations which were in steady national demand and for which there seemed no internal source of employees. These included such trained workers as chemists, engineers, nurses, physicians and tool and die-makers. Heavy industries including the

aerospace industries, at that time, were experiencing critical shortages in trained technicians, machinists, toolmakers and other craftsmen. The demand, nationwide, for professionals, particularly in the health fields, could not be filled through internal sources. An estimated one in eleven professionals in the decade from 1965-1975 was projected to be an immigrant (Mott, 1966). Even in New York City, which was losing 103,000 factory jobs in 1966, the Human Resource administrator was projecting a shortage of skilled workers (The New York Times, January 8, 1968).

While labor remained wary of major modifications in legislation admitting greater numbers of immigrants, the unworkability of the older MacCarran-Walter Act and the serious shortage of new workers to replace those aging within union organizations, reduced labor opposition to immigration. Other traditional opponents of immigration--including The American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, The American Legion, and The Daughters of the American Revolution--relaxed their pressure, recognizing the limitations of current policies and the nationwide concern for both labor shortages and divided families. The growing liberalism of the decade, the popularization of the contributions of America's immigrants by John Kennedy (1964) and the growing influence of various immigrant and ethnic organizations combined to effectuate major modifications in immigration legislation under the Johnson administration (The Annals of the American Academy of Science, 1972).

The Immigration Act of 1965 had several major changes which effected Greek immigration into this country. Under the new legislation, the national-origins quota system of 1952 was abolished as of July 1, 1968 (although other measures were enacted in December, 1965). Until that time, unused visas were to be added to a pool and redistributed to countries with backlogs on preference

waiting lists. A limitation of 170,000 immigrant visas, exclusive of parents, spouses and children of U.S. citizens, was established on a first-come basis. A ceiling of 20,000 visas, annually, was imposed for any one country, apart from independent countries in the Western Hemisphere. Under these new provisions, individuals in certain occupational areas could enter the country without prior guarantee of a job. Other categories of occupations needed prior commitment from an employer that a job at prevailing wages was reserved for the immigrant. A third category of occupations were those already filled by the American labor force. Immigrants attempting to enter in those positions would not be granted visas. These immigrants might, however, gain entry under other status, e.g., student or relative. Since the lists were continuously revised according to job trends and regional as well as seasonal needs, numbers of immigrants entering under each occupational category shifted annually. In 1965, for example, aliens in professional occupations, such as physicians, engineers, mathematicians, chemists, and physicists could enter without review by the Department of Labor and without preexisting jobs. Hotel clerks, farm laborers, janitors, grocery store clerks and kitchen workers were not to be admitted without individual review by the Labor Department. During the early months of the new certification program, 27% of the job openings processed involved professional, technical and managerial occupations; 31% were in skilled and semi-skilled occupations; and 37% were to fill service jobs. Engineers, accountants, architects, nurses, teachers, draftsmen, tool and diemakers, machinists and tailors predominated in the approved professional and skilled occupations. Technical and research establishments, as well as employers in manufacturing and construction had both actively recruited overseas workers and employed large numbers of foreign workers during this period (Mott, 1966).

A review of Table V suggests the occupational breakdown of Greeks entering this country under the new legislation. Table VIa, VIb, VIc, shows the dramatic increase in the numbers of Greeks immigrating and their sex ratios during the post-1965 period. While it is difficult to determine whether this breakdown reflects the pattern of the outmigration of certain sectors of the Greek occupational structure or the peculiarities of America's economic needs, the breakdown does suggest something of the trend in immigration and the composition of the immigrant community emerging during this period in the United States. During the earlier period of Greek migrations to this country we noted the preponderance of unskilled peasants and agricultural workers. The middle classes and professionals stayed in Greece. By the mid-1960's, the farmers and farm managers were still immigrating into this country, but in numbers proportionately smaller than those of the skilled technicians, operatives, craftsmen, tool and die-makers and professionals. The complete decline in the numbers of farm workers in the post-1970 period is particularly interesting in terms of the backgrounds of immigrants in the new Greek enclaves. The large percentages of women immigrants, often filling domestic or household worker status, reflects the combined pressures of changing status of women in Greece and the demands for household help in the United States (Mott, 1966).

Much like the immigrants preceding them, these newcomers gravitated towards the major urban, industrial centers. Table VII shows the partial distribution of Greek immigrants' intended place of residence during the period from 1967-1972. In 1969, for example, 30.4% of those Greeks landing in America planned to live in New York City. The other major sites of settlement included Massachusetts, Illinois and New Jersey. Some of these immigrants might, like their predecessors, prefer urban life. The presence of large numbers of other

Table V

Percent of Greek Immigrants Admitted by Major Occupational Group -As Percent of T

# Admitted	1972 11,021	1971 15,939	1970 16,464	1969 17,724	1968 13,047	1967 14,905	1966 8,265	1 3,
Professional Technical & Kindred Workers	5.3	4.1	4.2	3.3	3.9	3.9	4.5	7
Farmers & Farm Managers	.1	1.3	3.6	4.8	3.8	5.5	5.1	
Managers, Officials and Proprietors	3.3	2.1	2.0	1.7	2.1	2.1	2.1	2
Clerical and Kindred Workers	1.3	1.1	1.8	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.5	2
Sales Workers	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0
Craftsmen, Foremen and Kindred Workers	9.2	14.9	13.5	11.1	8.7	8.4	8.4	9
Operatives & Kindred Workers	11.9	12.1	10.9	8.9	9.0	8.5	7.7	8
Private Household	5.7	4.9	3.1	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.2	0
Service Workers (except private household)	8.4	6.9	5.0	4.8	5.7	5.2	5.4	8
Farmers, Laborers & Foremen	4.7	3.6	1.7	2.3	3.2	3.1	3.0	0
Laborers (except Farm & Mine)	2.2	2.0	2.8	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.4	2
Housewives, children & others with no occupation	47.1	46.7	52.1	55.8	57.0	57.2	57.3	56

Source: U.s. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S

Table V

l by Major Occupational Group -As Percent of Total Greek Immigration Years 1960 to 1972

0 64	1969 17,724	1968 13,047	1967 14,905	1966 8,265	1965 3,002	1964 3,909	1963 4,825	1962 4,702	1961 3,392	1960 3,797
	3.3	3.9	3.9	4.5	7.1	6.8	7.5	5.6	5.9	5.9
	4.8	3.8	5.5	5.1	.9	1.5	2.7	2.2	1.9	2.1
	1.7	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	3.2	2.1	1.9	3.0	3.0
	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.5	2.2	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.5
	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.7
	11.1	8.7	8.4	8.4	9.5	8.3	7.4	6.6	7.5	7.5
	8.9	9.0	8.5	7.7	8.8	8.5	8.8	7.5	7.9	7.4
	1.7	1.5	1.2	1.2	0.6	0.8	1.2	2.5	2.2	2.8
	4.8	5.7	5.2	5.4	8.7	7.1	6.3	6.6	6.8	7.1
	2.3	3.2	3.1	3.0	0.8	1.7	2.1	2.3	1.1	1.6
	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.4	2.1	1.7	3.0	2.5	3.3	3.4
	55.8	57.0	57.2	57.3	56.6	59.8	55.9	59.6	57.6	56.9

Service, Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office) 1960 - 1972

Table VI a

Greek Immigrants Admitted by Country (Greece) of Birth, Sex and Age

MALES

Year	Total Immi-gration	Total Males	Under 5 Years	5-9 Years	10-19 Years	20-29 Years	30-39 Years	40-49 Years	50-59 Years	60-69 Years	70-79 Years	80 Years and Over
1972	11,021	6,017	342	294	677	2,296	1,253	654	260	182	48	11
1971	15,939	8,637	565	472	1,069	2,802	2,051	1,047	382	200	38	11
1970	16,464	8,619	573	496	1,168	2,489	2,066	1,109	443	221	40	14
1969	17,724	9,262	619	674	1,375	2,414	2,144	1,209	549	236	37	5
1968	13,047	6,678	414	488	1,019	1,639	1,564	788	485	217	60	4
1967	14,905	7,754	474	595	1,186	1,759	1,861	952	614	262	46	5
1966	8,265	4,186	256	263	540	1,085	1,012	433	365	195	27	10
1965	3,002	1,449	105	65	170	598	362	56	44	32	14	3
1964	3,909	1,875	159	79	299	686	411	121	62	44	14	-
1963	4,825	2,390	170	105	293	805	631	185	113	72	16	1
1962	4,702	2,030	121	84	282	735	450	96	113	102	21	6
1961	3,392	1,640	145	75	173	561	385	126	84	65	23	3
1960	3,797	1,937	153	98	288	664	395	144	113	57	24	1
1959	4,507	2,177	297	139	389	720	355	93	83	71	24	5

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office) 1960 - 1972

Table VI b

Greek Immigrants Admitted by Country (Greece) of Birth, Sex and Age

FEMALES

Year	Total Immigration	Total Females	Under 5 Years	5-9 Years	10-19 Years	20-29 Years	30-39 Years	40-49 Years	50-59 Years	60-69 Years	70-79 Years	80 Years and Over
1972	11,021	5,004	281	259	1,035	1,397	822	594	315	222	66	13
1971	15,939	7,302	498	475	1,449	1,986	1,391	831	366	209	83	15
1970	16,464	7,845	545	523	1,473	2,003	1,542	918	463	283	77	19
1969	17,724	8,462	604	638	1,609	1,979	1,686	1,052	515	283	77	19
1968	13,047	6,369	334	450	1,257	1,574	1,235	692	474	260	77	16
1967	14,905	7,151	461	518	1,269	1,684	1,396	767	578	336	108	34
1966	8,265	4,079	268	242	759	1,044	742	319	366	257	70	12
1965	3,002	1,553	90	67	368	583	240	95	59	36	13	2
1964	3,909	2,034	123	83	408	793	325	138	99	46	15	4
1963	4,825	2,435	149	106	441	978	405	148	139	52	15	2
1962	4,702	2,672	121	81	437	1,071	358	171	222	161	44	5
1961	3,392	1,752	159	73	306	708	268	113	76	39	10	-
1960	2,797	1,860	158	89	321	716	305	119	95	47	9	-
1959	4,507	2,330	292	164	451	663	328	188	132	79	30	3

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office) 1960 - 1972

Table VI c

Number of Greek Immigrant Males and Females Admitted to U.S.
by years 1959 - 1972 in Total Numbers and Percentage

Year	Males	Females	Ratio M/F	Total Admitted
1959	2,177	2,330	.93	4,507
1960	1,937	1,860	1.04	3,797
1961	1,640	1,752	.93	3,392
1962	2,030	2,672	.75	4,702
1963	2,390	2,435	.98	4,825
1964	1,875	2,034	.92	3,909
1965	1,449	1,553	.93	3,002
1966	4,186	4,079	1.02	8,265
1967	7,754	7,151	1.08	14,905
1968	6,678	6,369	1.04	13,047
1969	9,262	8,462	1.09	17,724
1970	8,619	7,845	1.09	16,464
1971	8,637	7,302	1.18	15,939
1972	6,017	5,004	1,20	11,021

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1959-1972.

Table VII

Partial Listing of Place of Intended Future Residence
by Greek Immigrants 1967 - 1972

Place	Year					
	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972
California	734	714	800	907	741	628
Connecticut	538	433	562	560	504	331
Illinois	2,548	2,217	2,673	2,128	1,919	1,397
Massachusetts	1,294	1,081	1,534	1,324	1,627	922
New Jersey	1,054	1,024	1,380	1,357	1,338	903
New York	4,570	3,711	5,223	5,005	4,630	3,628
Ohio	572	610	802	665	614	423
Pennsylvania	620	526	1,272	1,447	1,350	486

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1967 - 1972).

Table VII a

Greek Immigrants Admitted by Specified Country (Greece) of Birth, State of Intended Future Permanent Residence, Rural and Urban Area and City from Annual Reports Immigration and Naturalization Service

Year	Greece	N.Y.S.	N.Y.C.	% of Greeks who stay in N.Y.C.
1972	11,021	3,628	2,960	26.8
1971	15,939	4,630	3,420	21.5
1970	16,464	5,005	3,562	21.6
1969	17,724	5,223	3,260	18.3
1968	13,047	3,711	3,046	23.3
1967	14,905	4,570	3,769	25.3
1966	8,265	2,548	2,164	26.2
1965	3,002	1,051	889	29.6
1964	3,910	1,308	1,120	28.6
1963	4,825	1,460	1,230	25.4
1962	4,702	1,435	1,230	25.6
1961	3,392	956	797	23.5
1960	3,797			
1959	4,507			

Source: U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, Annual Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office), 1960 - 1972.

Greeks, particularly of family members living in and around urban centers might have also compelled immigrants to seek homes in cities. Relatives who acted as an immigrant's sponsor and was responsible for him, for finding him a job and for sustaining him if he was unemployed often found housing for the immigrant in an area close to the relative. These urban areas were also often the best places for Greeks to find jobs. Many of the older immigrants had already established businesses in which the new arrival could find employment. In other instances, the presence of the new immigrant himself, settling among others like him, offered the enterprising immigrant the opportunity to offer services and consumer goods desired by the immigrant community. Other immigrants simply settled closest to their point of landing, and frequently that meant New York City. While subsequent relocation to other cities was possible, many sought initial lodging in and around Manhattan. The major centers for these immigrants were Astoria, Queens, Washington Heights in Manhattan, and sections of Brooklyn.

If the pattern of settlement resembles that of the earlier immigrant, the types of occupations are in many cases the same or similar to those pursued during the pioneer days of Greek migration and after. Certain industries in New York, for example, found new sources of skilled tradesmen and talented women in this new immigrant population. The garment industries were particularly eager for new seamstresses and cutters. The jewelry industry was similarly delighted with the skills of the newcomer (Personal Communication from corporate Presidents in each field). The restaurant business and all its ancillary trades, including wholesale vegetable and fruit industries, discovered new waiters, counterboys, cooks, and at times, adventuresome, self-enterprising competitors setting up new operations.

The process of securing jobs in the various industries owned by Greeks and non-Greeks is revealing of the long networks stretching into immigrant communities. While newspaper advertisements occasionally attracted employees, more frequently an informal network of links connected those who had businesses to those desiring jobs, and those who had jobs to those who needed them. As one informant commented, there were more eager workers waiting for jobs than one knew what to do with. If an employee became ill, a sister, relative or simply another immigrant appeared to take her place.

For some Greeks these jobs were viewed as major success stories. To others, their jobs and their life in America were verging on failure. Success, however, had many meanings. One young man who had worked many months on Greek ships for barely $100 a month was earning over four times as much as a counter boy in a New York City diner. He had obtained the job through his cousin, who was also his sponsor. He lived in a nice apartment, bought new clothes, sent money home; he was a king. His cousin was always pestering him not to become too lazy and contented. But he didn't care about the future. His success was instantaneous and complete at this moment.

Other immigrants who came with better skills and past exposure to managerial positions discovered that recapturing those same positions in America was more than just difficult. One manager of a sweater mill from outside of Athens related how his brother who had been in America twenty years, would not let him apply for managerial positions. Instead, and ostensively because of his language problems, the brother directed him into low-level operative positions in local machine factories. The man was despondent not only because he had to take a more demeaning position at a lower salary scale, but also because his brother would not let him pursue opportunities at higher levels.

To a degree, the immigrant believed that his brother felt that immigrants start at the bottom and work their way up--regardless of their capabilities when they arrive here.

Another woman who was a secretary in Greece could find nothing here but a job in a local corner grocery at minimal wages. She was trying to pass the high school equivalency examination to apply for secretarial jobs. A young female hairdresser and cosmetician from Athens was still looking for a job in New York. Her brother was studying for a degree in marketing at night school while working at the airport as a mechanic during the day. An accountant had opened a travel agency and insurance company after unsuccessfully trying to set up an accounting practice in the city.

Typical of all these people, and unlike the former crewman, was the fact that they had all come with middle class backgrounds only to discover that they could not simply re-enter their old positions without renewed struggle. Tensions within families flared as immigrants and relatives differed over definitions of responsibilities and over proper courses of action. Greek voluntary associations were often viewed, by the immigrant, as insensitive to his needs. New organizations and revivals of older, almost defunct ones prospered. Soccer clubs and renewed political clubs were two organizations that found rejuvenation among the new immigrants. The Archdiocese-affiliated churches discovered that the influx of new immigrants generated conflicts similar to those of earlier periods, yet under the new conditions, endowed with new vigor. Concern over the amount of Greek education, the use of Greek in liturgies and the type of religious ritual performed in the church became, once more, sources of continuous friction.

In some communities, such as in Astoria, the voluntary associations

attempted to attract the new immigrants by luring their emerging leaders into the clubs. AHEPA attempted to give one young immigrant aspiring to political importance in Astoria the presidency of the local chapter. From his perspective their intent was simply to attract the more successful among the newcomers and perhaps to elevate their declining chapter into new prominence.

The church attempted to deal with some of the immigrants' problems through a local self-help community agency, designed along the lines and programs of Jewish community organizations. The community agency was supposed to assist Greeks in finding employment (which it rarely could do), assist them to return to Greece if they ran out of funds, help with any illness or hospitalization for which they might not have resources, and care for those women and children abandoned in America. Its services were varied and extensive, but of undetermined impact on the spatially dispersed, rapidly growing community of people unfamiliar with such service agencies and wary of turning to strangers for assistance.

The local church and community leaders, primarily American-born or earlier immigrants, established a local community agency called HANAC which sponsored English classes for Greek speakers, attempted to determine the needs of the local community and provide programs to fulfill those needs and connect the new immigrant with the older community.

Conclusion

At the time of the study it was difficult to determine what course of future action the new Greek immigrant would pursue in America. By the early 1970's, immediately after the peak of new immigration, economic recession hit the country and many of the industries in which Greeks were employed layed off numbers of immigrants indefinitely. Future research will only begin

to tell us how the immigrant coped and how the older community responded both to their own particular difficulties and to those of the newcomer.

The ongoing thread throughout the history of Greek settlement in America was one of conflict. Populations of Greeks, during each period of migration, lacked prior organizational structure. The emergence of new institutions and the recreation of older institutional forms, such as the Greek Orthodox Church in these immigrant communities offered one avenue for Greeks to seek collective, shared goals as well as personal security and individual identity. Which kinds of institution a Greek would join and how that institution would influence his future relations with other Greeks and other Americans varied. The crucial variable seems to have been the socio-economic position of that person and his aspirations for future mobility or security. In the conclusion we attempt to assess the importance of this variable for institution-building in local Greek Orthodox Churches in Astoria.

Chapter II

Astoria and the Greeks

To any tourist who has spent but a brief moment in Greece, the sights and sounds of Astoria today bring back strange reminders of the hours spent leisurely lounging in corner cafes or wandering through the narrow streets of the Plahka. The streets of Astoria are filled with the faces of old Greek women dressed in the black skirts and dark scarves of traditional peasant Greece. The conversations by the fruit stands, in the markets, by the bus stops and in the diners are unmistakably in Greek. The animated gestures of young men standing on street corners whistling at young girls walking by are those of Greeks. The storefront tavernas, converted from recently vacated shops, are filled with Greek men playing cards, drinking sweet coffee and endlessly debating, debating, debating!!! At night, the restaurants and nightclubs, darkened behind curtained windows, mix gambling and Greek food with the twang of the bouzouki and the exotic shrill of the Greek singer.

To Greek and non-Greek alike, Ditmars Boulevard is rapidly being transformed into Omonia Square "West." Thirty-first Street looks like the Plahka. The mayor of New York was even planning to change the main street in Astoria from Broadway to Athens Avenue. This tiny corner of Queens is becoming a "Little Athens," a new urban village much like those we had thought, or had hoped, had long vanished from the streets of New York City.

Ethnic villages do not bloom overnight. People create them - immigrants who want to remold, or who simply cannot avoid remolding, the cultural atmosphere and social life of a community until it feels, looks, sounds and smells like a comfortable, familiar reincarnation of the life they had previously

led back home, wherever home might be. For a peasant, one of the most traumatic effects of migration and resettlement in a strange, urban culture is the loss of the security and comfort found within the well-known social order of the village. In the village, rules of conduct are established by tradition and are accepted and enforced through often informal, possibly supressive, but at least acknowledged sanctions. As stifling as such a community might be, it offers peasants a sense of security. It is that security which is lost in the complexity overwhelming a migrant in an impersonal, complex, bureaucratic city. For the uprooted peasant, the initial problem is how to cope in an unfamiliar setting with a traditional repertoire of cues and codes. He must either recreate a community which shares his traditional norms and sanctions or redefine his rules of conduct and concepts of order into ones which will facilitate interaction within the new social system (Francis, 1945; Douglas, 1966; Greeley, 1974). In America, ethnic quarters in urban centers traditionally offered the immigrant a source of refuge and security in the midst of a culturally heterogeneous, structurally complex and unfamiliar city.

The transformation of Astoria into a "Little Athens" is not the first Astoria has undergone. The new Greek ghetto is built upon the remains of the "Little Berlins," the "Little Dublins" and the "Little Italys" which preceded it in Astoria. The area was typically not the first place immigrants settled, but one which attracted them to resettle amongst its trees, parks and pleasant surroundings.

Astoria is technically part of Long Island City, an area designated as such by the city. It lacks an inherent unity or political integrity. The district was incorporated in 1870. It stretches along the East River from the Bowery Bay to Newtown Creek. A Con Edison plant occupies the northern tip of the

district. Astoria itself is primarily residential with rows of two-family houses and low apartment buildings characterizing the area. Two middle-income city housing projects at Woodside and Ravenswood border Astoria but residents do not consider these part of the Astoria residential district. The southern boundary of the residential area adjoins a light industrial and manufacturing district. The accompanying map outlines the area illustrating the industrial and residential, park and transportation areas within it.

Scarcely a half century ago, Astoria was a sparsely settled semi-rural village used by the wealthy as a summer resort. Early settlers still reminisce about swimming in the then clean East River and promenading along the river banks on Sunday afternoons. Impressive mansions can still be seen along the river. Both the residential and the industrial districts grew slowly before the turn of the century. Growth was linked to the development of transportation lines between Long Island City and central Manhattan. Once ferry, rail and eventually road connections were established, the long shoreline and extensive creek and stream system made Long Island City highly desireable for the relocation of mid-Manhattan's light industries. Some development began after 1864 when the Queens County ferry started twice daily runs between the district and Manhattan. Transportation improved with the construction of the First Avenue Railway in 1870. Passenger and freight did not move freely between the two areas, however, until after the turn of the century. In 1912 the Queensborough Bridge was completed and in 1915 the Pennsylvania Railroad tunnel was built, inducing industry to follow, bringing with it a labor force to live and work in the surrounding region. By the turn of the century, cabinet and veneer works, two major oil companies and a motion picture studio had opened.

As the growing industrial center expanded, the area attracted a

heterogeneous population. By the 1880's, the first ethnic enclave in Astoria, German-town, was already well formed. Most of the Germans settled in Astoria when the Steinway Piano Company opened its factory, employing 1,200 Germans. The beer gardens and saloons built by the Germans were known for decades throughout the city. As the Germans settled in company-built housing around 26th Avenue and Steinway Street, the Irish followed them into Astoria, forming a residential enclave near Ditmars Boulevard. Italian immigrants soon formed a similar quarter in the southern part of the area. Pockets of Bohemians and a scattering of Jews, Slavs, Poles and Canadians sprung up among these larger ethnic enclaves.

The Greek migration into Astoria did not begin until the early 1920's. Greeks usually resettled in Astoria after living many years in Manhattan. They sought pleasant homes outside the central Manhattan ghetto. New refugees swelled midtown ghettos pushing older residents to seek better homes. The Greek community in Astoria began as a scattering of families, often related to each other, who rented or bought homes on blocks throughout the area. There was no physical territory considered the Greek quarter. Certain streets were designated as typically Greek or populated by Greeks. One Greek real estate broker is credited, according to older residents, with pulling Greeks into the community. Informants estimate that there were hardly more than a few hundred Greek families in Astoria in 1930. Twenty-sixth Street was one area of high Greek concentration. Thirtieth Drive was another. Steinway Street and Broadway had scatterings of Greek families. In comparison with other ethnic groups, Greeks were a small population dispersed throughout the area. Greeks unfortunately were never included as a distinct category for census tract records so we do not have a clear indication of the size or growth of the Greek community.

Residential patterns on typical blocks where Greeks lived illustrate the dispersion and intermixing of Greeks amongst members of other ethnic groups. One informant growing up in Astoria records that in one threefamily home an Italian, a German and a Greek family shared the building. In another, Greek, Irish and Slavic families lived in adjoining apartments.

Part of the Greek's early sense of having achieved demonstrable levels of economic success derived from his ability to live inconspicuously among non-Greeks. Relatives, particularly during the early decades, lived closer to each other than they desired. Part of the reason for this proximity was the shortage of housing. The other part was the fact that many kinsmen continued to feel responsible for relatives. If a man bought a three-family home, he often shared upstairs apartments with relatives. If a relative was unemployed, he offered the apartment to him until he could pay rent.

Informants, however, repeatedly emphasized that there was much hostility emerging from spatial proximity between kinsmen. Kinsmen, they commented, were always "popping in on you." Or, you would argue with kinsmen over money or rent or wives or mothers-in-law.

The growth of both Astoria and its Greek community was slow. Immigration from Greece to the United States all but ceased during the 1930's and 1940's eliminating immigrant sources of growth for the area. Economic conditions in the 1930's limited housing construction in Astoria and restricted the immigrant's ability to move out of mid-town ghetto districts. Job instability further reduced residential mobility. It was not until the post-World War II period with the passage of refugee bills and the rapid construction of new housing in Astoria that the Greek community began to grow. We still have no complete documentation on this growth pattern. Census figures illustrate the general expansion

of the area. Informants comment that the growth in Astoria during the post-war period stemmed from three sources. The first was from the internal expansion of American-born Greeks. Some Greek-Americans returned from the war to marry and set up families. Many were attending night school while employed in day-time jobs. Several informants reflected on how many of their friends either lived with or near family in Astoria. The second source of growth came from those Greeks who had grown up in Manhattan and were now moving into more "suburban" communities. Astoria and Queens still held the image of a more "rural" community. The presence of an established Greek Orthodox Church and a Greek community often attracted other Greeks, particularly those of the immigrant generation.

A third source of growth was not to begin until the middle of the 1950's. The influx of refugees from the Greek Civil War peaked in the mid-decade. Greeks, in many cases, found homes near them in Astoria for kinsmen fleeing the civil war. Astoria began to grow as some of these refugees settled there. Other refugees located in central Manhattan. Many of these did not resettle in Astoria until the 1960's.

The community grew from an estimated three to four thousand at the end of the war to almost 40,000 by the mid-1960's. From a HANAC survey of tract 115 in Astoria from the 1970 census, out of a total of 2,227 individuals, 905 were Greek born or U.S. born with Greek parentage, 2,003 were Italian born or of Italian parents, 63 were of Irish birth or parents. In percentages of total population, Greeks made up 18.36%, Italians 40.63%, and the Irish 3.05%. However, if the HANAC revised census survey is taken into account, the percentage of Greeks soars to 37.62%. The accompanying map on page 78 provides some indication of the distribution of Greeks throughout the borough of Queens

The census map above has been shaded to reflect the distribution of the Greek foreign population based on the U.S. Bureau of Census Foreign Stock by Nationality and Country of Origin,4th Count File, Table PS-2. Concentration of Greeks are indicated, in decreasing order, by numbers from 1 to 5. In addition a dot is placed in those census tracts in which the 1970 census counted between 1 and 25 Greeks. The citywide dispersal of the Greek population is evident from these maps as are the major areas of concentration.

and their particular concentration in the Long Island City-Astoria residential area. The in-migration of Greeks occurred slowly. Their numbers, relative to those of other ethnic groups remained small. Yet, during this long period of gradual absorption, American-born Greeks, immigrants from pre-war years and post-war refugees began to fuse into a single Greek community. Economically, the community seemed homogeneous. Most of the immigrants, regardless of age or time of immigration, were self-employed in small restaurants, diners, shops, groceries, or worked as waiters in restaurants or in large hotels. Some immigrants worked in the fur or garment industry. Many of the American-born Greeks became lawyers, professionals, or middle-class in occupation. Some went into their father's business, expanding and adding to the older company.

By the time of the study, Greeks and non-Greeks viewed the Greek community as a homogeneous group, singular in background and sharing common interests and goals. As we shall see, this was hardly accurate. Yet, it was an image perceived as true by both insiders and outsiders alike.

By the mid-1960's changes were beginning to affect Astoria. These changes reflected more general patterns of urban decay and suburbanization characterizing other parts of New York City, and typical of other major American cities at mid-century. Greeks and non-Greeks who had fled crowded Manhattan ghettos for the spacious, tree-lined streets of Astoria, discovered that their view of Astoria, or Astoria itself was changing. Astoria seemed no longer spacious but congested with people. Its streets were overwhelmed with traffic. The elevated subway, once a desireable connection into the central city, now seemed an eyesore and a noisy disturbance. Parkways and bridges had already shifted attention away from residential areas close to mid-town

businesses. Residential districts in more distant, suburban communities were now attracting people. Industries were moving out of Long Island City. Workers and managers were following industry. The attached row houses, once a symbol of escape from poverty and the achievement of independence, became symbolically obsolete. Banks began to refuse loans for home improvement creating financial strains on landlords and homeowners who wished to maintain their property. Those who wished to stay felt the situation was hopeless. Decay was imminent. Single family homes on grassed plots in Hempstead and Merrick and New Rochelle attracted the younger Greek-American, and often his parents as well.

Non-Greeks--Italians, Irish and Jews--accompanied the Greek in this outward migration. Those Greeks and non-Greeks who remained in Astoria, and there were many, began to worry about the empty stores, the deteriorating housing and the possible future of Astoria as a new kind of ghetto--a Black one. Conflict between expanding industries and residents intensified over questions of land use, noise levels and environmental anxieties. Long Island City was one of the city's most important industrial centers. In 1960, Queens had 160,000 jobs. One-fifth were located in Long Island City. A significant portion of the jobs for the city's low-skilled workers were located there. Industry and residents fought endless battles over land use.

Those Greeks who remained loyal lovers of Astoria held on to their houses and struggled to maintain their neighborhoods. The Astoria Civic Association run by Peter Vallone, a young Italian lawyer aspiring for political position in the city, set up an auxiliary police force and sponsored youth programs to keep vitality and interest in the area. Merchants, some of whom had been in Astoria for thirty years, formed their own association to encourage others

to open shops in the business districts. Even those who stayed and those who continued to earn good livings worried about the future. Some of those most actively involved in St. Demitrios moved to new homes in Whitestone and Jamaica, Queens--more prestigious residential areas. Even Father Poulos, the priest at St. Demitrios, lived in Whitestone, and his assistant, Father Pappas, lived in Flushing.

By the late 1960's, the outmigration was economically and emotionally depressing the community. Housing vacancies increased. The over-all population had declined from 210,800 to 190,800 while the proportion of Blacks and Puerto Ricans was increasing. The older Irish section near Ditmars was emptying. As the process accelerated, real estate values in Astoria declined, housing began to deteriorate and commercial interests began to disappear. As stores and homes were left unattended or vacant for longer and longer periods of time, fewer and fewer people bought or renovated their property and values began to decline.

It was just about this time that new Greek immigrants were beginning to land in New York City. Some of these newcomers gravitated to the old Greek community on Ninth Avenue in Manhattan. Many others, however, were attracted to Astoria. To some degree, the aesthetic attractiveness of the community pulled the new immigrant to settle in Astoria. He, like those immigrants who preceded him, preferred the trees, the parks, and the proximity to shopping and transportation which Astoria still offerred. More important to the newcomer, his relatives and other Greeks living or working in Astoria was the compelling attraction of living near other Greeks in apartments which were affordable and close to jobs and transportation. Greeks who sponsored brothers, sisters or other close or distant kinsmen discovered that their kinsmen could

not usually afford to live in Hempstead or Merrick--that is, near the sponsoring relative. Astoria had housing priced for the newcomer. There were often other family members living close enough to Astoria to supervise and assist the immigrant if the sponsor was unable to. Travel to jobs was much less costly if the immigrant worked in either Queens or Manhattan--where most of the unskilled, skilled and technical positions were located. New Greeks were quite willing to share apartments to afford rents in Astoria near other Greeks. Pooled resources kept expenses low and permitted individual families to save. Greek landlords and realtors encouraged families to share apartments. Pressures often increased on older residents to vacate apartments for new immigrants. Homeowners quickly recognized that the new immigrant wanted to buy property. Typically, the immigrant pooled savings with relatives to purchase a multifamily house. One family would live in the basement and rent the upstairs to pay for the mortgage. Some two- and three-family homes were selling for well over $90,000 in the early 1970's. Rentals for apartments in these homes averaged $250 - $300 for four rooms. Greeks selling their homes would accept second mortgages from the buyer, leaving the buyer with, at times, two or three mortgages to pay. Many of the older residents sold their homes at prices which far exceeded their original costs. With the profits they moved to new homes, often equally expensive, in more prestigious residential areas. The new immigrant, in turn, found himself in an increasingly homogeneous, densly populated ghetto.

For some Greeks and non-Greeks in Astoria, the influx of new immigrants was a financial bonanza. Housing starts once again increased. Home refurbishing stimulated painting, decorating, hardware and related businesses. Professionals--doctors, lawyers, accountants, for example--and workers, such

as bartenders, salespeople, musicians, at both ends of the occupational scale, discovered their ability to speak Greek and to understand the new immigrant invaluable for the growth of their practices or for their indispensability in the local job market.

But, for other Greeks, the presence of the newcomer generated tension and unrest. As we considered in Chapter I, the new immigrant differed from earlier Greeks in skills, past experiences, and exposure to American culture. For the Greeks and Greek-Americans who had long struggled against their own distinctiveness, against their economic disabilities, against their stigmatized political and social status, the presence of the newcomer was an unwelcome reminder of struggles hopefully past. Perhaps most irritating to the older Greek was the fact that the newcomer was settling in Astoria immediately upon his arrival in America. Astoria had been the place to which other immigrants had struggled to relocate. Astoria, for most of the earlier immigrants, was a community in which you resettled after you had paid your time struggling in the overcrowded ghetto. In the ghetto you learned how to be an "American." In the ghetto you paid your dues to those who demanded cultural conformity and a period of poverty to prove your endurance, your hard work, your commitment to a future in America. If you could afford to move into Astoria, you had proved your worth. You also signified that you were moving into the middle-class--you had past the initiation and now you could enter mainstream America. For the immigrant and the American-born Greek, the presence of the new Greek challenged their allegiances to both America and their Hellenic ancestry, and demanded reassessments of their alliances with other ethnic groups and their identities as both Greek and American. In the following sections we consider the economic and political impact of the new Greek on the Astoria community

and how this impact has affected relations among Greeks and between Greeks and non-Greeks, both as individuals and as ethnic groups.

Souvlaki and Irish Whiskey: Ethnic Economics in Astoria

Interspersed throughout Astoria are small shopping districts with ancillary professional offices and city service buildings. Some of these shops and services traditionally catered to the particular needs of one or another segment of Astoria's communities. In general, however, shopping districts were marked by their lack of ethnic distinctiveness and their desire to consider the broad consumer needs of a working class community. This was similarly the case with professionals in the area. Most professionals attempted to appeal to the widest spectrum of individuals from diverse ethnic backgrounds. The rapid, large-scale influx of new Greek immigrants, accompanied by the gradual outmigration of other ethnic groups necessitated a redefinition, for many local businessmen, of their own ethnic identities, accompanied by re-evaluations of the needs of their customers and the kinds of services the local businessman must offer.

The accompanying street map illustrates the major shopping districts in Astoria. Steinway Street, from 34th to 38th Avenues is Astoria's major commercial center. Most of the shops on the street are owned by members of many different ethnic groups. Small dress shops and men's haberdasheries, jewelry shops and paint stores, barber shops and luncheonettes, present ethnically neutral faces to the consumer public. A Jewish name or an Italian one might reveal the ethnic background of the owner of the shop. But the service offered or the goods presented are general brand names and are undistinctive in appeal. When asked to discuss their own buying practices, merchants candidly commented that price competition, not ethnic competition influenced their business

practices. They felt that the general cultural orientation and common socio-economic position of the typical Astoria resident demanded an ethnically neutral positioning of products. Even store owners who developed more distinctive appeals--such as Jewish delicatessens or Italian bakeries--claimed that customers came from many ethnic groups. No one group dominated economic activity. Further, suppliers for these various businesses were of varied ethnic backgrounds. A closed network from producer to wholesaler to retailer encompassing a single ethnic community was not typical, if at all present among these retailers.

Among local professionals, efforts to attract clients from the entire residential community precluded the formation of ethnically exclusive professional practices. This search for a wide appeal to a general public was evidenced in a variety of ways. Affiliations or partnerships between lawyers, for one example, manifested the conscious concern of individuals for cross-ethnic links into the community. While no complete survey was taken, lawyers themselves commented on the frequency with which partnerships were formed between members of different ethnic groups. Mr. Z., a middle-aged Greek attorney who had practiced originally with a large corporate law firm in Manhattan, had moved in the late 1960's to join an old friend, a Slav, in a new law practice. Their newest associate was an Italian. Another Greek lawyer, Mr. M., had an Italian partner. Mr. V., an Italian lawyer who had grown up in Astoria had brought an Irish friend from law school to form a practice in Astoria. Only two of ten law offices surveyed were composed of members exclusively from one ethnic group. Of these 25 lawyers, 40% were married to women from other ethnic groups. One Greek, for example, was married to a Ukranian girl. An Italian was married to a Greek, and was very flattered when I thought he

was Greek. Attorneys admitted that referrals and contacts outside of Astoria brought them clients regardless of where these people lived. The backgrounds of the attorney, and of his wife, were often considered important in providing avenues to future clients. Many of the lawyers also sought clients through their affiliations with various voluntary associations. One Greek attorney belonged to both the Greek Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Italian American Club. Another Greek belonged to the Sons of Italy, through his wife's family, and to the Greek AHEPA, through his own. Irish and Italians predominated in the Astoria Civic Association.

Informants were openly willing to acknowledge that they had formed their law partnerships, not necessarily their marriages, for utilitarian purposes, as well as for friendship. Links between members of different ethnic categories in professional offices were viewed as legitimate methods for increasing public exposure and for gaining entrance into the heterogeneous community. Ethnic identities were not neutralized nor masked. It remained important to be recognizeable as a particular kind of person. Yet, by itself, a single ethnic identity was considered confining. It may have been even more confining for those professionals who were members of small ethnic communities--such as Greeks or Slavs. But, it seemed of similar importance to members of larger groups such as Italians and the Irish.

Doctors and dentists also tried to project ethnically neutral images without distracting from their own ethnic identities. For members of certain ethnic groups, such as the Greeks, there were very few doctors or dentists of Greek descent --at least until recent years. Most Greeks interviewed had previously or were still going to non-Greek doctors. Only in the past five years had Greek doctors opened practices in or near Astoria. One pediatrician had

opened a practice in Flushing. Most of the children attending the Greek school visited him. An internist from Greece had finally established a practice after many years in Astoria. He was about to relocate in the late 1960's because his patients were moving away. Several specialists gave talks at the St. Demitrios church for the purpose of informing church members not only of special diseases peculiar to Mediterraneans, including Greeks, but also to inform them that there were Greek doctors available to care for them.

The influx of new Greeks into Astoria has generated a series of first gradual, then more rapid modifications in the practices of merchants and professionals serving the local community. The first changes were evident around the streets and shopping districts immediately adjacent to the new Greek enclave. Small, Greek operated, Greek-oriented shops were springing up in previously unrented stores or rundown buildings.

If we walk around the Ditmars area on 23rd Street we see the Aldos Democratic Club, one of the first Greek Democratic Clubs, founded in 1924. Across the street is the Basis Funeral Home. Down the block is the Stani Greek Restaurant and Nightclub. Souvlaki is sold in front and a restaurant with a Greek singer and bouzouki music is in the back. There is also a plumbing supply shop, a Jewish-owned hardware store, a Greek-owned, Greek-stocked corner grocery store, a Greek travel agency, an Italian Bakery, a Greek real estate office, and across the street another Greek real estate office. Down the block towards 26th Street is the law office of Mr. M., a Greek attorney previously active in the Aldos Democratic Club as well as in the Italian Democratic Club and the Democratic Party. He is next door to a little Greek candy store run by an old Greek immigrant. Down further is a Cuban restaurant-grocery store. Around the corner is a Greek cafenion. Table VIII provides a list of stores in

Table VIII

Stores, Owner-Operator Ethnicity and Length of Time
Under Present Owner-Operator

Name of Store	Ethnicity of Owner-Operator (if known)	Length of Time under Present Owner-Operator 0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20+
23rd Avenue between 21st and 27th Streets						
Kiryakosgia	Greek	X				
Kiamos Restaurant	Greek	X				
Albertos Bakery	Italian					X
Stani	Greek		X			
Kreott	Greek	X				
Rose & Joes Italian Bakery	Italian					X
Simon's Hardware	Jewish					X
B & B Fruits	Italian	X				
Continental Jewelry	(unknown)					
Fresh Fruits	Greek			X		
Astoria Superette	Greek		X			
31st Street between 23rd Avenue and Ditmars Boulevard						
Theoharis Pharmacy	Jewish-Greek					X
Fabric Store	Greek	X				
Hunter of the Sea	Greek	X				
Auto School	Greek			X		
Kostas Men's Wear	Greek	X				
Weber's	Jewish					X
National Shoes	national chain		X			
Movie Theater	(unknown)					X
Scheinfelds Children's Store	Jewish					X
Camera Shop	Jewish					X
Athinaiki Gonia	Greek		X			
Astros	Greek		X			
Argitakos Travel	Greek		X			
Royal Furniture	(unknown)					

the Ditmars area and the length of time each has been in business under the current (1974) operator. Approximately 10 of the 25 stores listed have been located in the Ditmars area for over 25 years. Half of these have been there over 30 years. Of these several are still owned by the original family and operated by sons or by fathers and sons. Many of these older businesses were owned by Jews. Simon's Hardware Store, Scheinfelds Childrens Shop, The Astoria Camera Shop, and Weber's Men's Store are still owned by Jews. Theoharis' Pharmacy was originally Jewish but had recently been sold to a Greek. Several of the shops which were under new management, i.e., opened less than five years under present managers, had been on the street much longer. B and B Fruit Company, for example, had been located on 23rd Avenue for over 20 years, but had new owners in the last 2 years.

If we look at the stores which have been opened in the last fifteen years, particularly those opened between 1965 and 1972, the influence of the new Greek immigrant becomes apparent. On 31st Street between Ditmars Boulevard and 23rd Avenue, 10 of a total of 16 stores randomly sampled were opened less than 10 years and were operated by Greeks. More importantly, the fish market, Hunter of the Sea, the fabric store, the Athinaiki Gonia Gift Shop, Argitakos Travel, the movie theater, all catered specifically to the needs of Greeks. The accompanying pictures illustrate the type of consumer products and the nature of the facades of these buildings. The writing is all in Greek, the shoe styles are imported from Greece and Italy, the books and souvenirs, the communion dresses and so forth are deliberately selected to attract Greek customers and to cater to their specific tastes and needs. Further, the methods for dealing with customers are similarly designed to reflect demands for personalized service among Greeks.

Mike Zapiti, owner of the Pilot Driving School, provides one case study to illustrate the responsiveness of the Greek entrepreneur to cater to the needs of the new immigrant community. Mike seems to offer all things to all people--and do so skillfully. He opened the Pilot Driving School in 1962 on 31st Street near Ditmars Boulevard. In the back of the store he broadcasts morning and evening radio programs in Greek. He prints a daily Greek newspaper and distributes it for a nominal 25¢ fee on local newsstands. The newspaper circulation was an estimated 100,000 copies in 1976. But the core of his business is his driving school. His instructors are all Greek-speaking. He has convinced the State Motor Vehicle Department to give the written test in Greek. He provides all the forms and assists new drivers in filling out their driving permits--and then he makes certain they arrive for their tests on time and understand the driving inspector when he is testing them on the road. Once an individual has passed his driving test, Mike then sells him car insurance, and life insurance, fire insurance, and other insurance policies which may or may not derive from car ownership. He also sells travel tickets, for those Greeks returning to Greece or sending tickets back to Greece to bring relatives over to America. His prices are not cheap, he explains, because he doesn't want his customers to feel they are being given inferior service. He wants them to pay for his services in reasonable amounts, and he provides them with personal care and confidence. He willingly sends those who object to his prices to other insurance or travel agents to compare prices and service. They always return to Mike Zapiti, he says--often after their first car accident. When an insurance agent has to pay a claim he loses his patience with the Greek immigrant. That's when Mike Zapiti shows them how he cares. It is for this care, this personal catering to sooth the

stresses of the immigrant, that people come from as far away as Brooklyn to do business with him. But Greeks, he says, want to feel personal links with those who are taking care of them. If you watch him in action, he treats each customer as a personal friend or dear lost relative, charming them and cajoling them to understand what he is doing and how it is in their best interest.

Some shopkeepers, particularly those Greeks and non-Greeks who have been in business many more years than Mike, object to demands by new immigrants for personalized service and specialized treatment. Prices are not to be negotiated in American shops. New immigrants try to get the storekeeper to lower a price or add additional merchandise for the same price. Non-Greek merchants are particularly irritated by this bargaining. Greek salesgirls object to customers trying to speak Greek so store owners will not understand what they are trying to do. Greek-Americans grow increasingly embarrassed as newcomers stand and debate whether or not they should purchase something.

The emergence of Greek owned or operated shops in Astoria and the efforts of other businessmen to develop a Greek-oriented trade has stabilized the economy of the area and generated a moderate degree of growth. Once vacant stores are now filled and fears of ghettoization and economic decay are gone. But, from the other side of the spectrum, non-Greeks and older Greek immigrants and Greek-Americans worry about the efforts of newcomers to encapsulate themselves in their own enclave and provide their own needs and services with minimal contact outside the Greek community. As souvlaki stands and street corner tavernas replace decade-old Irish bars, local residents worry that these new Greeks are not going to join them as "assimilated Americans." Most of the older residents refer to themselves as just that, "assimilated Americans" --real Americans. That these Irish and Italian and older Greek immigrants

and their children might have assimilated with their own Irish bars and Italian bakeries beclouds the issue, they claim.

But another problem emerges for the newcomer and the older Greek. The local enclave can hardly support the size of the new immigrant population. Most of the new immigrants are employed in occupations outside of Astoria--at least from what surveys and interviews can approximate about immigrant employment patterns. The local shops operated by Greeks seem to be served by Greek wholesalers, whenever possible. Greek manufacturers and businessmen, diner owners and restaurant operators have returned to the immigrant community for their semi-skilled and technical employees, as well as for their unskilled dishwashers and counter boys. An effort is being made by those Greeks who need employees to find them among the new immigrant. An enclosed economic network is forming and from informants'comments exploitation is threatening the new Greek and sending many into unsuspecting servitude for other Greeks. This may be more the case for the illegal alien working as a dishwasher or operating a frankfurter stand. But legal aliens still object to their fellow Greeks abusing their work rights--hiring them at substandard wages, failing to pay social security or taxes for them, refusing to allow them to form or enter unions, and so forth. The degree to which this is representative of all Greeks employing new immigrants is difficult to assess. Both new immigrants and those Greeks concerned with the condition of the immigrant in New York expressed repeated dismay over the growing abuse of the newcomer by members of his own ethnic community.

From the perspective of many employers, however, the fact that there are so many opportunities for new immigrants to go to work for other Greeks is aiding the entrance of the newcomer into the mainstream economy. Without

the established Greek economic base, many employers and even some immigrants believe that unemployment among new immigrants would be overwhelming, that most immigrants, regardless of past skills and experience, would be confined to unskilled menial positions. The Greek employer provides the immigrant with personal care and concern, offering him a job while he learns English or improves his ability to deal with the American society.

For those wholesalers serving Greek retailers, the presence of a new base of Greek shopkeepers and restauranteurs has permitted the Greek wholesaler to expand his own operations. Competition with non-Greek wholesalers for control over the Greek business community remains active. Attitudes among Greek retailers towards using Greek distributors and wholesalers is mixed. Some small businessmen object to using other Greeks for goods and services. Such practices, they feel, permit the wholesaler to know how well, or badly the buyer is doing. Success and failure are things to be kept away from other Greeks for fear they may abuse the information and capitalize on it for themselves. Business interests have to be kept secret. Envy generates bad relationships in business. On the other hand, efforts by the Greek businessman to completely understand negotiations often necessitates that he do business with another Greek or with an interpreter--neither of which is safe or satisfying.

The effects of the new immigrant on Astoria's commercial economy have been extensive. For some individuals the impact is a positive rejuvenation of an almost decayed community. For others, the new immigrant community poses a potentially disruptive, dangerous quality to previous practices and attitudes.

Demands for personal service are replacing more impersonal business practices and stimulating the emergence of an immigrant economic base. Yet, the tendency of Greek immigrants to gravitate towards jobs offered by other Greeks is also leading to unknown degrees of exploitation, alongside expanding economic opportunities for possibly unemployed immigrants. The dilemmas are understandably imposing for both immigrant and older residents, Greek and non-Greek alike. In all cases, questions of personal identity and public practices are being called into question. Public images of businesses and of those operating them, of professionals and their clients, are being reconsidered and redefined.

Ethnic Politics

The changes generated by the formation of a Greek ghetto are perhaps most clearly apparent in the transformations occuring in alliances and allegiances within the local political structure. As in local level economics in Astoria, past political relationships reflected the dominance of large ethnic groups: i.e., the Italians and Irish and the links of smaller groups such as the Greeks, to these more powerful political blocs. Appeals to the general public, however, tended to obscure local ethnic cleavages. Balanced party tickets typically characterized electoral politics in the community. Today the entire stasis between traditionally powerful ethnic groups and previously subordinate ethnic groups is facing the challenge of young Greek politicians capitalizing on a growing bloc of Greek immigrant voters.

For the past decade, if not longer, Italians have held a virtually unchallenged hegemony over local Astoria politics. The Irish who previously controlled local party politics had long since abdicated to the more powerful Italians. The Irish were still able to hold certain positions within local political clubs and occasionally even ran for office. Greeks who sought positions controlled

and distributed through political patronage during these years were forced to ally themselves with Italians through the regular Democratic Party or through the local Italian Democratic Club. Greeks seeking appointments to judgeships or Assistant District Attorney positions had to spend years dutifully licking stamps or raising money for the prominent Italian candidates. Within the Greek community itself, Greek politicians had little leverage. Greeks, one after another, rejected any suggestion that they might vote for a Greek over another candidate simply because he was a Greek. Greek politicians, in turn, had nothing to offer their constituents. Menial jobs were poorly paid and hardly incentive for a Greek to elect a Greek candidate. The Greek community itself was poorly organized. Most individuals were successfully pursuing their own interests without the formal support of the Greek community or of Greek associations. The Greek's economic allegiances were typically linked to members of other ethnic groups or to other parts of the city, or to both. As a result, aspiring Greek politicians had little to offer the Greek community in return for its support. The politician had even less to offer the dominant Italian political machine in exchange for its endorsement.

Local Greek Democratic Clubs were hardly more supportive of aspiring candidates than the community. These clubs, the Aldos, for example, were social centers where men met to play cards. Greeks seemed to have little interest in the formal machinations of party politics. As individuals they loved to advise you on how to run a campaign or on who was going to win or even on how to run the country. These clubs could barely begin to tackle the problem of getting a Greek official elected to public office.

Most aspiring Greek politicians realized their personal impotence. They had little to exchange for votes. Few Greeks seemed to care about

elevating the stature of Greeks as a category through the electoral process. A Greek assemblyman wasn't terribly different from the average Greek, they said. They both had to make it on their own. Individualism was the accepted route to success and, as a result, the ideological demise of Greek political efforts. Those who did gain entrance into politics had limited leverage in the party machines. Party leaders knew Greeks could not deliver Greek votes so there was no advantage in having them on a ticket. Those Greeks who did run for office more often than not ran as Republicans, a certain kiss of death in Democratically controlled Queens.

Mr. M. offers us one illustration of the strategies and frustrations of political leaders in the older Greek community. At the time of the study, the early 1970's, Mr. M. was already in his mid-fifties. His career as a politician, or an aspiring one, had peaked and begun to slide. His influence in the local Greek community was waning. His future as a political leader in the local party was long overdue, and no longer awaited. He had finally recognized his failings. He had turned his attention to his law practice. He had married. His ambitions were silent, and as we talked he wanted to know where he had gone wrong.

Mr. M.'s father and mother had immigrated to the United States from Asia Minor around the turn of the century. His father had, among other things, started several small retail businesses. None were very successful and Mr. M. had had to drop out of school to help support his family. He finally completed high school and eventually worked his way through college and law school after the Second World War.

His childhood, his first jobs, and his college and law school experiences, however, were all spent with members of ethnic groups other than his own.

His friends were predominately Irish during his childhood; Jewish and Italian after college and law school. When he grew up there were hardly enough Greek kids in his neighborhood to hang around with and few of the Greeks he knew went to college. He always seemed to work with non-Greeks. And most places he had lived were ethnicly heterogeneous, dominated usually by Irish, Italians and Germans. Most importantly, Mr. M. had to rely on many of his non-Greek friends to find his first jobs and to get promoted within them. His first job in a construction firm carrying lumber was wrangled from an Irish friend. It was still an era when WASP-only ads explicitly or subtly excluded Greeks and others from many of the more desirable sectors of the urban economy. Consequently, Mr. M.'s early experiences demanded a recognition of the importance of network connections into other ethnic groups and the limited utility of ties into the Greek community.

In order to put himself through law school, Mr. M. eventually formed a wholesale-retail fruit and vegetable business with his brother. Yet, most of their distributors were not Greeks, but Jews, and most of their clients were not Greeks, but Jews, Italians and Germans. Even his wife was German. His future clients eventually came from a diversity of ethnic backgrounds. He estimated that, until the influx of new Greek immigrants in the post-1965 period, not even one-half of his clients were Greek.

Mr. M.'s political career seems to simply reflect one other area in which this dependence on non-Greeks was manifested. During the 1950's, when Mr. M. was a young lawyer, and an aspiring politician, he had become active in the local Greek political club. He had even chaired the organization at one point. His deepest involvement and commitment, however, was in the regular Democratic Party--an Italian dominated organization. In his own opinion, he

was the second or third most important figure within that organization. In the opinion of other members of the Democratic Party, he had never really reached that level in the organization hierarchy. His competitors for gifts of patronage were all Italians. Most of them had stronger claims for the judgeships and Assistant District Attorney positions than he did. Mr. M.'s reasons for placing so much importance on his membership in the regular party were revealing. The local Greek club, he felt, was in reality little more than a local card room. Its ability to organize Greeks into a voting bloc with significant power was dubious if not ludicrous. It could muster its regular members for card games but not for the machinations of electoral politics. Most expressed the sentiment that there was little the politician, in general, and Mr. M., in particular could do for them. Everyone else was out for their own interest. So was the politician. Why should they trust him? Why should they vote for him?

In actuality, the club, the politician, the regular party did very little for the Greek or for his community. Greek politicians had very little to offer in exchange for local support. The few jobs Mr. M. could offer through his connections into the regular party were typically limited to sweeping floors or working on construction crews. Even these were hard to arrange. They were certainly not the type of jobs desired by upwardly mobile Greeks. Nor were there sufficient quantities of these jobs to permit Mr. M. to construct a significant base of clients, even if he could find individuals who wanted these kinds of patronage jobs. Greeks, by and large, wanted to be independent of patronage links, and, if possible, self-employed. Clientship was inhibiting not facilitating to these goals.

For the aspiring Greek politician the situation was a frustrating one

within the existing context of local politics. Mr. M.'s power, or potential power, within the local party was emasculated. Without an independent source of support or supporters, he was forced to remain in the dependent status of client or recipient of patronage. He lacked a base from which to convert that received into support which might have balanced his position within the local party. He had no real constituency. He had an ethnic identity and a professional position, neither of which were convertible into political leverage in the party structure. Greeks rejected efforts to organize them into a voting or power bloc because of their shared identity and did so for essentially the same reasons that Mr. M. had done: Greeks had little to offer in the exchange system, whether it was for economic or political, personal or collective gain.

Mr. M. recognized his deteriorating position when the judgeship and District Attorney's positions were passed on to the Italian ranking below him on the patronage scale. He had fought the leader of the party over the decision, as well as over the control of the organization. Despite friendly support and assumed alliances with other Italians within the party, Mr. M. found himself without real power. He finally resigned from the organization and from the local Greek club. His position in the local club was facing pressure from a young Greek labor leader, Mr. T. The combination of forces was too great for Mr. M. and he virtually retired from public political life to pursue his private law practice in semi-seclusion.

Mr. T., the young labor leader who challenged Mr. M.'s hegemony over the local Greek political club, offered a different style of ethnic political strategies within this same community. Mr. T. had grown up in a small town in Greece. His father and grandfather had been mayors of the town, and held every expectation that Mr. T. would also become the town's mayor. Instead, Mr. T.

emigrated in the 1960's, to the United States. Here in the United States he planned to become mayor of New York City. His political strategy was to slowly, methodically construct a network of supporters and resources to catapult him into notoriety and power. His tactics, however, often marked him as a maverick within local party organizations and his rivals within that organization viewed his methods and his successes with suspicion and trepidation. He was operating very much like a traditional Mediterranean patron. His tactics were succeeding, it seemed, because he was able to convert his external sources of support into resources valued and utilized by the larger Greek community, particularly the immigrant sector of it. And, he was distributing these resources through vehicles, kinship and patronage links, and through ideologies valued as desirable by that segment of the Greek community.

Mr. T.'s own career in the United States reflects his political strategies. He had rapidly worked his way into the leadership of a local union of airport workers at Kennedy Airport. In his position he could allocate jobs, mediate for his workers, and dispense union funds to support federal programs and legislation affecting the needs of his members. He controlled 1,000 men at the airport. Many of these were Greeks, particularly newly arrived immigrants. The network of friends and kinsmen extensively spread the word about this young labor leader. "One guy came to me and he was practically a drunkard. He couldn't hold a job. I sobered him up," said Mr. T., "and found him work and helped him work out his problems. There's no one else to help the Greek." "One guy even had a heart attack. They couldn't find a cab or a doctor. So they called me. So I got in my car and took him to the hospital."

In analyzing Mr. T.'s strategy more closely we can begin to see how he planned to pursue his career. In the last election (1970) he had run against

the candidate of the regular party for assemblyman from his district. He had lost by a few hundred votes. He wasn't going to lose the next time, he said. His tactics were simple. At the local Greek club, he offered classes for Greek immigrants in English and in citizenship. When these immigrants could pass the citizenship examinations, Mr. T. arranged for a sponsor, sent the immigrant down to the examination with that sponsor, and then coached the immigrant on the questions to be asked and the appropriate answers. Once they had their papers, Mr. T. called them up at registration time and made certain they could vote. At elections, he even picked them up by car and took them to the voting booth. He even showed the immigrant how to use the machines to make certain the votes registered.

Mr. T. didn't expect to win in the next election, but he planned on having an expanding base of supporters within the near future--and it is that future that his opponents were afraid of.

An analysis of Mr. T.'s other efforts to extract resources and support from outside his own ethnic group and then distribute them to members of the Greek community permits us to further clarify the tentacle-like nature of his network and the redistributive elements in his political strategy. Mr. T.'s connections into public agencies were most revealing. He had managed to secure jobs for his supporters in the Human Resource Commission in New York City, in the State Liquor License Bureau, in the Hunting License office, and himself was a member of the Selective Service Board for his district and the local Planning Board. He also had links into Senator Kennedy's and Senator Buckley's offices. His most serious problem, he confessed, was that he had difficulty finding well educated, English speaking Greeks to fill vacancies in bureaucratic offices. Greek-Americans, by and large, did not respond to his style of

politics or to his personal charisma. While they might be well qualified for these administrative positions, most found such avenues into bureaucracy unappealing if not immoral, and many recognized the limited opportunities such appointments offered for their own upward mobility.

Mr. T.'s personal life and organizational affiliations were equally revealing. He was married to an Italian woman, yet repeatedly bemoaned the loss of Greek culture in his own home. He sent his sons to military academies, yet worried because they could not speak the Greek language. He belonged to the Italian-American League and the Sons of Italy, through his wife's connections, yet members of the local Greek organization--the AHEPA--wanted him to run for its presidency. In fact, they wanted him to run for the national presidency of the organization, an organization growing in size and respectability, as well as in influence in national political structures. While Mr. T. was not himself a member of the local Greek Orthodox church, nor any of the smaller rebel churches, he had placed his subordinates in key positions within the established church in the community. Conflicts frequently arose between Mr. T. and the local priests over the development of community programs--athletic programs and immigrant assistance programs, for example. Both leaders competed for control over the local populace and both vied for control over federal, city and state sources of funds to sponsor these programs for the local community. Mr. T.'s delicate but successful move to plant a supporter deep within the church political and administrative structure was a most effective maneuver, and quite reflective of the type of machinations promoted by Mr. T. in his quest for power.

Ideologically, Mr. T. was promoting a type of incapsulation. At mass rallies he rejected Archdiocese efforts to introduce English texts into the Greek Orthodox liturgies. He appealed to his fellow Greeks to retain their culture

and appreciate its distinctive beauty. He encouraged Greeks to join the Democratic Party, because Greece was the home of democracy. And he badgered local Greek businessmen to unify into an organization which would help new Greeks start their own businesses and receive equitable treatment in non-Greek businesses.

Here was an aspiring politician with a very different game plan for essentially the same goals as his predecessor, Mr. M., only Mr. T. seemed to be winning the game; his predecessor hardly broke from the starting gate. Mr. T. was pursuing his political goals through his personal charisma and incapsulationist ideology, but most importantly through the practical benefits derived from an instrumental network, heterogeneous in make-up, and linked into major external sources of jobs, funds and avenues for assisting his constituents. The critical difference between these two political leaders was that Mr. T. was not only in command of resources, but they were resources desired by other Greeks. He not only had something to sell but someone else was willing to buy it, and in the process form a personal style of patronage link.

Mr. M., in contrast, was never able to establish his position as a distributor of needed goods. He remained a client embroiled in party politics, yet forced, for want of an independent base of supporters, to conform to party dictates--without the autonomy needed to achieve personal success in his political goals.

Cultural Impact

These economic and political transformations of Astoria are effecting segments of the community in different ways. For the Greek and the non-Greek "old timer" in Astoria, the new immigrant community is a settlement of strangers, cultural aliens. The immigrant is viewed with all the primeval emotions and

fears which forever greeted the stranger. It is not simply that the new Greek is transforming the neighborhood but that he is doing it in his strange costume with a strange language and with strange customs. He poses a threat to all who have lived in Astoria, even if all the changes he brings, all the economic revivals he stimulates, all the political coups he stages are the best things which have ever happened there. It is not surprising that this strange Greek is evoking candid expressions of disgust and dismay, fear and envy among other Greeks, i.e., those who consider themselves integrated members of the community. The older Greeks have forgotten the difficulties that they, too, experienced during their early period of adjustment in America. To many of these older Greeks, their own struggles, successes and their present acceptance into the non-Greek world make the presence and distinctiveness of the new immigrant a distasteful reminder of a stigmatized past as the strangers themselves. The responses of the older Greeks, the Greek-American and the non-Greek to the new immigrant sheds much light on the differences between these two communities, on the attitudes affecting their interrelations and their respective positions in the different categorical models of who is a "Greek."

To the older Greek residents, the newer immigrant doesn't dress properly; he doesn't even try to look American. His pointed shoes and open neck shirts with his hairy chest sticking through are offensive to "American Greeks." "I've seen them sitting on the buses together," said one elderly informant, "and their endless chatter in vulgar Greek makes them stand out like sore thumbs. It was disgusting. I didn't want to say anything in Greek so anyone would know I was one of them." "The newcomer, said another young student, "stands on the street corners and makes passes at my girl friends or calls me a queer for wearing my hair too long. They are always getting into fights over insulting

remarks made to Greek-Americans passing by them. They constantly make fun of our Greek but they can't speak a word of English."

A waiter and a restaurant manager commented on how the new Greeks hang out in coffee shops, holding up tables while they sip a cup of coffee for hours. "They can do that in Greece where there aren't any customers but they can't do it here when people are waiting."

Frequent references were made to the new Greek's ability to work very hard at several jobs. He earns a lot of money. The employers of the hard-working Greek admire and exploit the immigrant's industry (and the fact that he will frequently work without union benefits and for sub-minimum wages). For the older Greeks who had to work hard to get where they are today, the instant successes of many immigrant Greeks is a thorn in a tender side and a danger to their jobs. The newcomer, they say, wants everything handed to him on a silver platter. "He may work hard but he doesn't contribute to the church and he wants to send his child to the school without paying. Churches and schools are free in Greece. We built them here and the newcomer doesn't feel obligated to support them and I don't like it." "The newcomer," another Greek added, "wants the priest to help him adopt a child in Greece or solve an immigration problem but he won't pay his sixty dollars to support the church. They all expect but no one wants to give." And yet, they make a lot of money.

So the arguments continue. To the new immigrant, the demands for contributions from the church or the Greek school are excessive. Why should he have to pay to receive sacraments in church? The fact that the Archdiocese needs money is immaterial, the Archbishop and Archdiocese are immaterial. Secular fundraising gimmicks are considered inappropriate to the sacred church. "The older immigrant and American-Greek community exclude us from their

discussions by using English in church meetings. Their Greek is artificial and snobbish. They don't speak the real form of Greek as it is spoken in Greece."

The Irish and Italian families interviewed had different responses to these strangers. Several families spoke of the rising crime rate in Astoria which they were certain was brought on by the new Greeks. At the local precinct the police Sargeant, an Irishman, and the police Lieutenant and Captain, both Greeks, assured me that the Greeks were a wonderful ethnic group. Crime hadn't increased since the Greeks had settled there. The Greeks took care of their own problems within their strong families. The figures, however, showed a 25% increase in local crime between 1969 and 1971. (A report from the Police Department, 114th Precinct showed the following statistics: crime in 1971 - 16,142 complaints, 1,854 arrests; crime in 1969 - 14,411 complaints, 1,187 arrests. This reflected an increase of 600, or 25%. At that time, there were an estimated 80,000 Greeks in Astoria.) The statistics did not break down the ethnic composition of those committing crimes so we could not conclusively determine if the increase was due to crimes by Greeks or to an increase in the crime rate of other ethnic groups. Nevertheless, to the man in the street, crime was increasing at a perceivable rate and the dangerous stranger, the Greek, was the cause of it. The fact that the local courts had recently added a Greek interpreter might lend credence to their perceptions.

Frequent comments were made about the wild Greeks driving into storefronts or rampaging like madmen through the quiet streets where children were playing. The rows of black limousines and Cadillacs, lined up three-deep on Friday nights outside local tavernas were, to some, certain signs that gambling and prostitution were going on behind the darkened windows. The police, of course, admittedly avoided the area. Without Greek accents, they felt they

couldn't get close enough to look, much less do anything anyway.

Teachers at the local schools commented on the tensions and frequent battles between "gangs" of roving Greek and non-Greek youths in the schools, on the streets and in the parks. These gang fights were both reflections of tension between adult sectors of the community and aggravations to those tensions. On neither level were the tensions resolved nor the sources eliminated. In both cases, be they competition for control over streets or parks grounds or over votes or dollars, the issue of who was to control remained couched in ethnic terminology.

For the women in Astoria, particularly many of the Italian and Irish women, antagonisms were cloaked by the superficial courtesies they continued to use when faced with a new Greek on the next doorstep. They remembered the friendly faces of the older Greek women on their streets and tried to continue what was once an amiable relationship with the Greeks. The new Greek woman, they complained, was reluctant to socialize. They granted that the new Greek immigrant probably could not speak English and perhaps had never interacted with a member of another ethnic group before settling in America. Yet the fact that she wouldn't sit and chat on the front stoop was viewed as insulting and endangering to social relations on the block. Moreover, many Greeks, out of fear or ignorance, or both, shielded their children from the other non-Greek children on the block.

For the average resident in Astoria, the presence of the new Greek was visibly producing economic and political modifications in traditional ways of selling goods and attracting clients. For the individual, however, the Greek immigrant was viewed as a threat to the very way of life accepted as the norm by most Greeks and non-Greeks in Astoria for the past several decades. This

visceral reaction, this emotional fear of the culturally alien stranger, was perhaps the more immediate and more disturbing one and ultimately may prove the more disruptive for relations within the Greek community and between Greeks and members of other ethnic communities in Astoria.

Chapter III

Priests and Parishes: Father Poulos and St. Demitrios

Throughout the history of immigration to America, religious institutions and religious leaders have held pivotal positions in the restructuring of immigrant lives and in the recreation of new social orders. The participation of Greeks in the "established" and "rebel" churches in Astoria reflects the central role played by immigrant churches in filling the economic, social and political vacuum created by the immigration experience. The two specific Greek Orthodox churches compared in this study represent the major trends in Greek immigrant adaptation to America: that of conformity to the dominant society and contrast from it. St. Demitrios, as we discuss in this chapter, reflects the tendency of immigrant churches towards conformity with the prevailing attitudes and practices of the dominant, White Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture in America. St. Markela, which we consider in the following chapter, reflects the second strategy, that of differentiation from the dominant form and the preservation of a distinctive, more traditional Greek Orthodox culture.

The relationship between the two churches represents one of the recurring patterns of sectarianism so typical among America's other religious denominations. The conflicting interests of different socio-economic classes and of the newer and older immigrants clearly surface as critical issues dividing these two churches and unifying their parishes into separate communities. Each community articulates its class position and political orientation through its endorsement of particular performances, particular strategies for religious leaders to pursue and in the particular internal structure established for the religious institution. From the material developed in these two chapters we

construct a model contrasting the two religious communities in terms of their emphasis on secular versus spiritual matters, hot versus cold imagery, order versus emotional expression in ritual performances, hierarchy versus equality in male-female, priest-lay and secular-spiritual relationships.

As I first headed out to Queens to meet Father John Poulos, the head priest of St. Demitrios church, I was made strangely aware of my own preconceptions about who is a Greek, how a Greek looks and lives, and where I might find the Greeks hiding in the ethnic melange which makes up white, middle-class Queens. My first error was to simply go the wrong way on the parkway and completely miss Astoria. Astoria is really quite difficult to miss. It is the first place you come to as you cross the Triboro Bridge and head out to Long Island. My own impressions of where white ethnics lived, however, led me further and further away from Astoria. Astoria looked too much like the blue collar districts in deteriorating industrial sections of a central city to house many Greeks. What I did not realize was that many Greeks were still working and lower middle-class and lived in Astoria near the light industrial sector circumscribing this old multi-ethnic community of blue collar and middle-class residents.

St. Demitrios is located on 31st Street and 30th Drive, right next to and slightly hidden by the elevated subway. It is large brick building with a tall domed roof, and a three-story school adjacent to it. While it is not overwhelming in size, neither is it as difficult to find as I made it out to be. It seems that I simply could not imagine this to be the building. Across the street and also under the El is a small Protestant church - a steepled, brown clapboard building with stained windows. It was here that I first went to look for Father Poulos and the Greeks. When this proved wrong I drove down to the next block

and found a large Catholic church. Somehow I finally asked directions back to St. Demitrios. I should have known where the church was. It was a Saint's day and the street was filled with older women dressed in black scarves and long skirts, much like those I had seen in Greece. But when I had gotten lost in Flushing and Jamaica, my image of what Greeks would look like and where I would find them became distorted. I started to look for a small, schismatic old-fashioned Greek church. The small brown church seemed appropriate. The large Catholic church seemed a logical contrast to the small church. With greater forethought, I would have realized that the Byzantine lines of St. Demitrios were well suited to a Greek Orthodox church built a half-century before. I was later to learn, however, that my original search for a small, eccentric, exotic Orthodox church was not absurd. Neither was my alternative search for a more modern, more expansive church building. Both existed in Astoria and together they provided important contrasts in the architectural design of the Greek Orthodox church and of the ethnic identity of Greeks attending them.

It was equally difficult to place my images of what a Greek Orthodox priest and the inside of the church would look like into the reality with which I was confronted at St. Demitrios. The offices of St. Demitrios are located downstairs in the basement of the church. As I introduced myself to the secretary, I became struck by the familiarity of the scene. While I have never spent long hours in temples or churches, there was something about the business-like atmosphere and the frantic pace of activity which told me that this really wasn't a religious setting but a business office. There was little that was distinctly Greek about the offices except an occasional use of Greek in conversations. Neither Gus, the bookkeeper, nor Sophia, the secretary, seemed visibly different nor ethnically distinctive from other bookkeepers or secretaries in

churches or offices. The secretary was busy typing, the telephones were ringing, and people were moving in and out of the office trying to solve what seemed an endless array of problems. What seemed so comfortable about the office was that it was just that: an office, handling the financial and social affairs of an institution. It could as easily have been an insurance company or a brokerage firm. It happened to be a church. But not all Greek Orthodox churches, I was later to find, had this same businesslike atmosphere. Not all had the bureaucratic underpinnings of a major business concern. St. Demitrios was to prove a particular type of church with many of its accoutrements deliberate additions initiated by Father Poulos when he first came to the parish in 1966.

Father Poulos had patiently waited for me while I traveled around Queens looking for his church. I was as perplexed by this priest and my reactions to him as I had been with my own preconceptions about the Greeks in general. Father Poulos just did not fit into my image of a Greek Orthodox priest. I assumed that he would look like those priests I had seen in Greece; dressed in long black robes, with long flowing beards and high, hard hats hiding his long hair. Instead, I found a clean shaven man, his hair stylishly brushed to his neck line. He was meticulously dressed in a black business suit. Were it not for his clerical collar, I might have mistaken him for a local businessman, certainly not for a priest. While Father Poulos is short in stature, he conveys a peculiarly tall appearance. He seems to fill the room with an explosive, assertive forcefulness. Perhaps his manliness struck me, or his worldliness both of which seem to exude not from his physical size but from the excitement generated in his face, his eyes and his enthusiastic greetings. As others later commented to me, Father Poulos' eyes seem to flash a booming greeting to you. His English is exceptional though he freely flows back into Greek,

selectively choosing those words which seem to most clearly express his ideas or feelings on a particular subject. As informants confess, Father Poulos is an enormous, energetic, modern man, a giant who, to some, must be trimmed down to manageable size. While I spent much time struggling to understand the codes and cues which made the priest and his church such familiar figures to me, I became struck by the priest's and the parish's concern with my own identity: i.e., how to pigeon-hole me into their categorical system. Father Poulos was initially concerned with my status as a student and a teacher, but much more anxious that I produce a monumental work which would acknowledge his successes and recognize the stature of Greeks in Astoria. My credentials, however, were of less importance than my background.

What was I, he immediately asked. "I was Jewish," I said, and immediately he seemed more certain that my study would be a great one. "If only Greeks were more like the Jews," he said, shaking his head as if Greeks were sad stepchildren of the Jews. "Jews work together and help each other; Jews are bright and successful," "Ah," he added, " your study will be a great success, a great contribution to the Greeks." (A great flattery to the Greeks.)

Among various parishioners I later interviewed, the patterned responses to my Jewish ancestry were much the same as the priest's. In one interview with Mrs. C., a Greek who ran the Archdiocese Social Health and Welfare Center, the conversation ran like this:

Mrs. C.: What is your background? Are you Greek?

Andi: No, I'd suppose you'd say I was Jewish-American.

Mrs. C.: No, that's not what I mean; what is your background?

Andi: My grandparents were born here. I'm third generation.

Mrc. C.: (at this point, quite perturbed). I know you are a Jew but Jewish people

came from all over the world.

Andi: Well, as far as I know, my great-grandparents came from England, on my mother's side, and from Austria on my father's, but there may be one or two from Russia in there as well.

Mrs. C.: Well, it's very important that you know where you were from. Even with the Jewish people, their original ethnic location has a bearing on their attitudes and their thinking.

I don't think Mrs. C. was terribly pleased with my English-Austrian ancestry. She didn't know too much about "those kinds of Jews" she said. Neither Father Poulos nor Mrs. C., nor any of those I interviewed from St. Demitrios, were at all concerned with my religious beliefs as a Jew. Mr. L. was quite dismayed that I, as a Jewess, didn't go to the beauty parlor every Friday or have a maid to clean my house. "What did I do each summer if I didn't go to the Catskills?" Then again, since I did not have any children, I really wasn't a full-fledged wife as yet. He was curious, though, if I told my husband how we were going to spend our money and where we were to live. "Jewish wives rule the roost," he said. "Jewish men aren't like the Greeks --Greeks know how to rule their castles and their women." No one, however, seemed to care if I understood the merits of Orthodoxy and how it differed from or was superior to Judaism or other religions. Even fewer, in fact almost no one, was interested in my attending Sunday services or Holy Week. My inquiries as to the time of church services were often looked upon as if I were peculiar; why would I want to attend an Orthodox Service? Neither priests nor parishioners were concerned with my learning the Orthodox religion. It was all viewed as immaterial to my study of the Greeks.

Like Mrs. C. and Mr. L., Father Poulos' concern with my Judaic

background seemed only important for his assessing the type of person I was and, perhaps, the possible chances of the success of my research. My religious conversion, even my understanding of Orthodoxy, were irrelevant. He was far more concerned with educating me in the accomplishment of his church. I almost felt that if I became Orthodox, my work would diminish in importance. Consequently, I found it difficult to learn much about the religion from the priests or even the parishioners. They were all more anxious that I see the new church building and the old age home, the youth program and the day care center. The priest preferred that I talk to Mr. B., the successful Greek businesssman, or Mr. T., the judge; Mrs. T., the PTA president or Mr . G., the school principal; Mr. D., the newsman and Mr. M., the politician. These were the important Greeks in the church and they were the people who could help me understand what the priest and the church were doing for the Greek community.

Father Poulos' analysis of my Jewish background, his concern with the relevance of my paper to his monument-building, his pragmatic approaches to the role of the church and the priest in an ethnic community, and his minimal concern with my religious education reflect a pattern of interest which later proved very different from that of the Bishop and priests who organized and ran the "rebel" church, St. Markela, on the other side of Astoria.

Father Poulos was born and educated in Greece. He was first planning to become a doctor but the war years came and disrupted his studies. Instead, he trained for the priesthood. He emigrated in the early 1950's and had his first parish in Jersey City. He came to St. Demitrios in 1966.

It is interesting that Father Poulos arrived at St. Demitrios at a crucial point in the church's history. The church was planning its fortieth anniversary marked by the completion of payments on the school buildings and the

initiation of plans to build a new church branch with additional school space in the nearby Ditmars area. The appearance of this new priest was an important one for the religious community. His priorities and programs, his politics and strategies for accomplishing them, reflected many of the same interests and values of his parishioners. He was American-oriented, ecumenical in his theology, secularized in his social programs. His parishioners articulated similar concerns for materialistic, secular and rational approaches to life and to religion. Yet, the parish community was changing. The older immigrant segment of the parish was diminishing in size and influence. The American-born children were leaving Astoria for the suburbs. The Greek refugees from the post-war years were beginning to settle in Astoria and demand increased consideration in the decisions affecting the school and the church. And, at precisely this point, the large-scale influx of new Greek immigrants was beginning to form a dense settlement in Astoria.

The priest was to discover that he became the pivotal point around and through which these different interest groups would seek to direct their plans for the church community. Each segment posed a different set of challenges to his programs and a different set of criticisms to his tactics. His ability to merge at least some of these Greeks into a cohesive religious community capable of accomplishing major fund-raising drives and sponsoring elaborate social programs attests to the priest's skill at manipulating the goals and ideals, and the symbols portraying them for these different types of Greeks.

The four decades before Father Poulos came to Astoria were years of slow, struggling growth for the St. Demitrios community. The church was originally formed in 1927 by 12 families who pitched a tent on a plot of land which is now the present site of St. Demitrios. Prior to that time, the small

Astoria community worshipped in the building housing the Archdiocese offices on 30th Drive between 28th and 29th Streets. When the Archdiocese moved its headquarters, the parishioners were unable to buy the building. Instead, they acquired the vacant lot on 31st Street and 30th Drive in the shadow of the noisy, irksome El. With only $1,600 in the bank, the small community made plans to build its church.

Construction of the church building took almost a decade. The religious community was small during the 1930's. The depression made most Greeks reluctant to venture into any major financial undertaking. The church basement was finally erected in 1930. The upper floor of the building was not completed until 1937. The inside iconostasis, the pews and furnishings, and the balcony were not finished until the post-war period. A school addition was built in 1957. In 1966, when Father Poulos arrived, the church was already holding three Sunday liturgies, and sponsoring a Sunday School for religious training, a G.O.Y.A. youth program, an active athletic program, a Ladies Philoptochos (charity) society, Boy and Girl Scout programs, and two P.T.A.'s. As the President of the church community commented at that time, "....everything which has been done in this community in the last forty years of strife and struggle has been done for the youth" (Logos, June 1967). The church was built and the programs supported in the hope that the Greek-American youth would be able to carry on the Hellenic heritage and the Orthodox religion yet in ways acceptable to, in fact helpful to, American society.

There is no precise tabulation of the growth of church membership through these years. Family membership in the church seemed to reach its peak in 1966 when 2,700 families belonged. By 1971 that number had declined to 1,500. While it subsequently increased in 1972 to 1,900, fluctuations in the

following years suggest that membership had reached a plateau. Baptismal records give some indication of the pattern of growth experienced by the church. Numbers of baptisms seemed to remain static between 1934 and 1945. Numbers generally fell between 60 and 80 per year with a peak high of 92 in 1936 and a low of 44 in 1938. Table IX illustrates the gradual acceleration in numbers of annual baptisms in the post-Second World War period. Further growth, despite the construction of a new church building and a new school, was uncertain and seemed to depend on the directions pursued by the new immigrants settling in Astoria.

One of the major problems in assessing church membership is that many Greeks pay annual contributions without attending any church or the particular church to which they contribute. Others pay their dues so their children can attend the day school. Church membership is mandatory for school attendance. Greeks who have not belonged formally to a church for several years might wish to baptize their child or receive Holy Communion. To receive sacraments you must belong to the church, so on these occasions they pay their dues. The survey conducted in 1968 by the church presents some idea of the range of attendance practiced by Greeks in the community (see Table X). Of the 1,000 randomly sampled Greek names from the Astoria directory, 45% of the Greeks questioned were active members in some Greek Orthodox church. Forty-five percent were non-active or unaffiliated. A non-active member might pay his dues but not attend. Of the active members, 90% attended St. Demitrios. Table XI illustrates the range of frequency with which these Greeks attend church. Only 37% of the active members attend church every Sunday -- a figure which Father Poulos and his assistant pastors found exaggerated.

We can also gain certain insights into the composition of this community from the 1968 survey, and from a subsequent one which I conducted in 1971.

Table IX

Number of Baptisms by Year

St. Demitrios Church

1934 - 1972

Year	No. Baptized
1934	78
1935	84
1936	92
1937	60
1938	44
1939	68
1940	79
1941	68
1942	79
1943	77
1944	89
1945	73
1946	109
1947	137
1948	127
1949	125
1950	122
1951	141
1952	156
1953	156
1954	156
1955	158
1956	175
1957	173
1958	162
1959	184
1960	168
1961	186
1962	195
1963	197
1964	223
1965	199
1966	216
1967	190
1968	256
1969	230
1970	255
1971	284
1972	276

Source: Church Records, St. Demitrios Church, Astoria, New York

Table X

Frequency of Church Attendance by Active Church Participants - 1968

Total	Every Sunday	2x/Month	1x/Month	Major Holidays	Never
51	19	15	5	11	1
%	37.2	29.4	9.8	21	1

Source: Random 10% sample of 1,000 respondents to 1968 St. Demitrios survey.

Of the community of active church members, 50% had lived in Astoria for more than 10 years. Of these, 15% were retired. This suggests that many of these Greeks had lived most of their lives in Astoria. Thirty percent of the sample had lived in Astoria 6-10 years. We might suspect that this reflects the population of post-war refugees gradually settling in Astoria after their initial period of settlement in Manhattan. Only 20% of the Greeks had lived in the area less than five years. This is not surprising since the influx of new Greeks had just begun at the time of the first survey and their impact on Astoria had still to be felt.

School records suggested certain other factors about this community. Almost all the parents of the children enrolled in St. Demitrios (89% for the fathers and 78% for the mothers) were born in Greece or Cyprus. An equally large percentage (82%) of the children, ages 5-12, were American-born. Further, sixty percent of these children were born while living in Manhattan. Most of the Greeks sending their children to St. Demitrios (and there were over 600 students enrolled in the school each year from 1966-1971) were Greek-born refugees and immigrants who had settled in America in the post-1945 years. Most probably first lived in Manhattan and then, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, relocated in Astoria. There are very few children of American-born Greeks attending St. Demitrios, despite the school's fine scholastic record and the escalating difficulties in neighboring school systems. In fact, only 17% of the larger community sample were American-born Greeks which is consistent with other documentation of the out-migration of Greek Americans from Astoria.

An occupational analysis of the community survey provides background on the socio-economic positions of these Greeks. Table XII presents a complete

Table XI

Occupational Breakdown - 1968

OCCUPATION	MALE No.	MALE %	FEMALE No.	FEMALE %
Restaurant Worker	71	28.5	5	1.8
Restaurant Owner	9	3.6	1	.37
Nightclub Worker	4	1.6	-	-
Nightclub Owner	0	-	-	-
Furrier or related	20	8.0	14	5.26
Garment Manufacturing	1	.4	-	-
Garment Industry (Tailor or Seamstress)	5	2.0	17	6.39
Craftsman	22	8.83	3	1.12
Retail Sales	16	6.42	7	2.63
Retail Management	3	1.20	-	-
Merchant Marine	1	.4	-	-
Maintenance	9	3.6	1	.4
Doctor, Lawyer, Professional	13	5.0	8	3.00
Technician, Engineer	1	.4	3	1.12
Barber, Hardresser	3	1.2	2	.75
Retired	38	15.26	14	5,26
Housewife	-	-	167	62.78
Clergy	-	-	-	-
Office Worker	6	2.46	8	3.00
Civil Service	2	.8	-	-
Unemployed	4	1.4	4	1.5
Factory Production	6	2.4	11	4.13
Frankfurter Stand Operator	5	2.0	-	-
Taxi Driver	5	2.0	-	-
Own Business	6	2.4	-	-
Student	1	.4	1	.37

Source: 1968 survey conducted by St. Demitrios church of Astoria residents with Greek surnames.

breakdown according to occupations from the 1968 survey. Approximately 15% of the population sampled were retired men. Twenty-eight percent of the males worked in the restaurant industry and another 3% owned their own restaurants. The other major occupational categories included craftsmen (8%), furriers (8%), retail sales persons and managers (7%), and doctors, lawyers and professionals (5%). For the females, 62% were housewives. Of those employed, 4% worked in factories, 6% worked in the garment industry as seamstresses, and 5% were furriers. Three per-cent of this group of women were professionals. While we might initially suspect that those Greeks who had been in America longest might also be the more successful professionals, some of the more recently arrived refugees and even the newest immigrants were well trained doctors and lawyers in Greece prior to their emigration. Some were not practicing in New York. They still had to pass the New York State Bar Examinations or they had to complete new certification to practice medicine. Some of the American-born Greeks interviewed still worked in restaurants--a few as owners, others as waiters. Several of the men employed in retail industries or in manufacturing were Greek-born refugees from the post-war period. Generalizations about the relationship between immigrant status, length of residence and occupation are consequently difficult to comment upon.

What is important as a general pattern, however, is the fact that almost 65% of the Greeks with children enrolled in the St. Demitrios school owned their own homes. What the numbers do not reveal is the level of commitment articulated by these Greeks at St. Demitrios towards a future life in the United States, a commitment to have their children receive the best education without jeopardizing their understanding of their own heritage, and a dedication to better careers and professions for their children in the future.

The intensity of this commitment found articulation in the two major building programs already underway in 1968. In 1967, 100 students were turned away from the St. Demitrios day school. The church itself was overcrowded and it seemed impossible to add additional liturgies. Father Poulos and influential parishioners decided that time was ripe for a new church building with additional classroom space and new facilities for church programs. Land was acquired in the Ditmars section of Astoria and architecural designs were selected for the new church building.

Despite apparent consensus among church members and among its lay and clerical leaders for the need for a new church, differences in opinion, often associated with the different ages of the various immigrant, Greek-American and refugee segments of the congregation, led to constant battles in church meetings over the design of the new church, the services it was to offer and the means to be used to pay its mortgage. One of the first controversies followed, instead of preceeded the construction of the new church, SS. Catherine and George. The new church was completed in 1971. The architectural design of the new building reflected, in the minds of some segments of the community, the major changes which had marked the entrance of the Greek immigrant into mainstream, American society. The old St. Demitrios building had strong Byzantine influences in its design. To many Greeks this style seemed to indicate the persistance of Hellenic sentiments in the hearts of the early Greek immigrants. The interior of the building had the dark, mystical atmosphere of an Old World church. The smell of incense, the heat generated by the candles, the dark walls and the heavily elaborated iconostasis was typical of traditional Greek Orthodox cathedrals. To some Greeks, and especially to many Greek-Americans, these smells, the congestion, the heat, the elaboration were old

fashioned remnants of the ancient world. Those who preferred this type of church were viewed as nostalgic dreamers of their past culture. The introduction of pews and the separation of altar and iconography from the pews, rigidly organized parishioners as they worshipped and spatially separated the parishioners from the spiritual nave and iconostasis. In earlier years these introductions met with much controversy.

The new branch of St. Demitrios, SS. Catherine and George, reflected the efforts of certain sectors of the community to impose a modern, sleekly designed, boldly conceived church over the older one. To some Greeks (both participants and non-participants in St. Demitrios) and to non-Greeks, this new church was a monument to modern architectural design in church building. To others, it was an abomination: aesthetically pretentious; structurally out of place. The church was viewed as either beautiful or a large, domed extravaganza. More vocal critics felt the new building was set abruptly in the midst of a quiet, tree-lined residential street. Perhaps the most controversial aspect of the new building was the long stairway curving downward from the second story sanctuary to the street below. The stairway, according to supporters of the new building, looked as if it led to heaven. To other Greeks, however, the angle of the ramp was so severe that it seemed to make the trip a difficult one. Perhaps, it even symbolized the struggle to reach heaven?

The inside of the new building was still without carpets, iconography and elaboration when this study was completed. Some informants were pleased by the starkness of the new sanctuary. Critics were dismayed by its barreness and its disregard for the importance of icons in the church ceremony. Reactions were mixed and confused. The cool blues of the stained windows, the enormous spaciousness of the domed ceiling, the rigidly placed, well-spaced pews and

the increased distance between pews and nave were viewed either as a well-ordered, modern monument to the new Greek and the growing prosperity of the Greek community, or as an emotionless, spiritually deadened sanctuary which, in form and perhaps in substance as well, was hardly different from a Protestant church or a Jewish temple.

This ambivalence was particularly noted on Sundays when parishoners could choose which church to attend. Those who frequented SS. Catherine and George commented on the orderliness and airiness. There was no longer the great crushing crowd struggling to reach the icons or to partake in Holy Communion. Now there was enough room, above and around them, to worship properly, with propriety. Some of the young people particularly liked the lack of pressure to spatially and spiritually interact with the priests and the icons. The traditional customs, even the kissing of the priest's ring, seemed strange and uncomfortable to these teen-agers, and even to some of their parents.

Other Greeks were distraught by these very same aspects of the new church. Orderliness and spiritual separation from the priests and the liturgy were not typical of ancient Orthodoxy. To some parishioners, the absence of crowds, the distance between people, the rigidity in the ceremony were like watching a staged performance without any personal sense of involvement in the message or in the spiritual experience. Some parishioners, in fact, were disturbed by what they felt was the priests' abuse of the reasons for constucting the church. Father Poulos, they said, was more interested in the basement of the building and what it could offer, than in the church sanctuary itself. Downstairs from the religious sanctuary was the area around which the church seemed to have been built. Here in the basement were two floors of classrooms and cardrooms. The classrooms were for a day care center and for religious

school instruction. The cardrooms were for the older men to come and play their card games and for the women to sit, knit and chat in front of the aimlessly wandering soap operas on the television screen. At times, when you speak with Father Poulos, you get the impression that the entire new building was built just so that these social and educational centers could be developed. Yet, while he was able to raise the funds to buy the property and at least get the church building completed, Father Poulos has had a great deal more difficulty getting the community to support these social and secular programs. The modern church seemed desirable, or, at least tolerated, but support of these social services seemed of questionable merit. "Who is going to pay for these services," Greeks asked, "And who will they serve?" To many it was clear the older, more financially established members of the community were to pay and the new Greeks or the older people were to benefit. The fact that ultimately the entire church community might benefit seemed unconvincing to many members of the community.

Of particular concern to these Greeks were the tactics employed by Father Poulos to convince them to support these programs. Father Poulos and his assistant pastors used what could only be considered unconcealed pragmatic, materialistic strategy to raise money, increase their own salaries, expand church membership and finance church programs. Many of the parishioners considered Father Poulos, in particular, to be a prime example of a successful businessman solving problems with highly skilled marketing techniques. Father Poulos' strategies for raising funds from his parish were not those of a self-sacrificing charismatic leader. His tactics were not couched in religious jargon nor supported through supernatural sanctions. He was not going to save your soul. His approach was straightforward and pragmatic. Fund-raising dinners were

very important. Community candy sales and raffles were equally exploited. Large donations were exacted from prestigious, wealthy members of the community. He attended one wedding, for example, with one of my informants. When the father of the bride asked how things were going in the new church, Father Poulos answered "Well, fine - but the church is in need of new carpets for the sanctuary. How would you like to make a donation in the name of the bride and groom?" Similarly at times when Father Poulos performed baptisms, he would afterwards exact donations from the godparents. He always sought the lowest bid to install sound systems into the school or to repair the roof on the church. He was quick to exact free bread from the Greek baker for Sunday mass or a free hall from a restaurant owner for a fund-raising dance. Prestige and merit points came to those who served the church as the priest felt they should. Mr. B., for example, donated pizza to the Old Age Home sponsored by Father Poulos, in Yonkers, New York. Dr. C. and Dr. N. helped to set up a Thalassemia clinic at the school.

To some parishioners, the Father's demands for funds and services seemed endless. "Won't he ever stop calling me," they moaned. "How much can I give? Isn't it enough that I have to pay to have my children baptized? Why doesn't he get back to being a priest?" To others, Father Poulos was the backbone of the Greek community. If he wasn't doing these things, they replied, who would take care of them? Who would help the new immigrants or their children learn to become Americans? Who would set up centers for the children of working mothers, or teach the mothers to speak English? "People may object to Father Poulos' straightforward approach to raising money, or to his business-like style in running the church," said Mr. L., "but the church is a business and it needs a businessman to run it." "You have to pay a mortgage,"

as Mr. Z. pointed out, "and you have to pay $4,500 a month on the new church. You can hardly afford half that amount and you still have to buy the rugs and pews and icons. You need a good businessman who knows who has the money and how to get it out of them." But the Father's tactics to get these resources, as well as to attract the new Greeks into his church and hence justify his decision to build the new building, were not proving as successful as he had hoped. Factions were forming within the parish to challenge his decisions and his efforts. The question over the mortgage was, perhaps, one of the more agitated battles, but certainly not the only one. The cliques which formed and the arguments which were parried back and forth communicated the pressures growing within the parish and reflected the intensifying dissonance between the conflicting demands of church supporters and the performance of the priest and lay leadership. One example illustrates this growing agitation. The $4,500 mortgage on the new building was coming due at the beginning of September, 1973, and the monthly payment funds were difficult to raise. Father Poulos and several of his supporters -- Mr. B., the pizza manufacturer; Mr. D., the newspaper reporter; Mr. K., the engineer; Mr. B., the stock broker and several others -- negotiated with New York City's Human Resources Commission to start a bilingual program for non-English speaking adults at SS. Catherine and George. The rent paid by the city, $2,000 a month for a year, was to ostensibly lease the building from the church. The rental fee would, in turn, be used to pay part of the mortgage. The program would hire Greek-American teachers and the course would be directed to helping Greeks, particularly those on welfare, learn English and hence prepare them for productive employment. The Greeks had a difficult time justifying their need for this type of program to the City. They had to scrounge hard to find 130 Greeks who were on welfare

in Astoria. While they finally found enough Greeks to qualify for city funds, the Greeks in St. Demitrios refused to support the plan. While the city, opponents of the plan argued, might be helping the church pay the mortgage without actually supporting the religious institution itself, it was appalling to them that Greeks would even think of going to the city, to outsiders, in search of funds. When the plan was presented to the General Assembly of the church for approval, tensions burst.

I had always known that Greeks loved to argue but I had never seen the public display of anger and the verbal skills at oratory which I observed that night. No one directly referred to Father Poulos. The arguments tactfully revolved around the strategies used by his committee to obtain the funds from the city as well as the use to which the funds were to be put. The power to negotiate with outside agencies, they argued, did not lie with the committee or the priest but rather with the Parish Council. The power to ultimately decide on the issue rested with the General Assembly, the 1,500 members of the parish. How could the committee present their proposal before the Assembly as if it were a fait accompli? Greeks, they argued could take care of their own debts and their own church without publicly broadcasting their difficulties to strangers.

Some Greeks at the meeting objected not to the tactics or to who controlled the power in the church, but to the possibility that non-Greeks might come to the school. This was a Greek school and a Greek church, they argued. They were built with the hard-earned monies of Greeks. The buildings should be restricted only to Greeks. Blacks and Spanish would come. A local barber whose shop was around the corner from the church was already complaining that Blacks and Spanish had come around asking about the school.

Other Greeks argued that older people should be able to take care

of themselves. The church, they said, didn't have to sponsor an English school for adults. The adults could go to the public schools. The church should care for the children. It was the young who needed the school. The private school at St. Demitrios was turning away Greek students because there weren't enough classrooms. Yet, the church was going to use the classrooms at SS. Catherine and George for adults. Money should be raised to expand the kindergarten and provide more classrooms for Greek day school students, not for adults. Even a day care center was more important then an English school.

The previous year, a day care center, sponsored with city and federal funds was also defeated by the Parish Council and the General Assembly because people were afraid that non-Greek children would be brought into mix with their Greek children. When the church tried to set up the center without public funds, i.e., for a monthly fee, they had so few responses that they dropped the issue altogether.

The year before that, the debates raged over how much Greek and English should be taught in the day school. Emotions ran high as debates tore into the issue of whether this was a Greek church and a Greek school, or whether the church and school were in America and should educate the children of the parish to excel in America. For the day care center and the adult center the exclusionary Hellenic forces won their battles. When it came to introducing more English into the schools, the American-oriented groups won, but the conflicts continued to rage and the feuding sides began to coalesce into better organized factions.

Throughout these long debates, Father Poulos said surprisingly little. I was surprised that he did not become an advocate of his own plans. Instead he sat quietly, following the debates, even reading, while his supporters acted

as his spokesmen. At times his temper would flair and he would respond vigorously to an emotional plea by an opponent. Most of the evening he sat patiently avoiding direct confrontations with opposing factions. He was not an arbiter nor a mediator, nor was he a leader of one side or the other. In fact, I realized then that his forte lay in the persuasive arguments he could wield behind closed doors where he could flatter and cajole without publicly alienating nor siding with one faction or another. He was a manipulator. He seemed to know quite well that he couldn't afford to lose from the church either side in the dispute. And yet, he was committed--for his own sense of honor and public prestige--to fulfill his obligations to the Greek Orthodox community.

When eventually the issues were defeated in smaller committees and in the Parish Council, the Father called together the more prominent and financially successful members of the church and formed them into an independent organization, HANAC (Hellenic American Neighborhood Action Committee). Using his network connections into city agencies, Father Poulos got the city to use HANAC as a middleman. HANAC would rent space, either in the church or elsewhere, and set up these programs and the city would help pay for them. Since most of the members of HANAC were also members of the Parish Council, the opposition to the use of city funds in the church disintegrated. Here were Greeks controlling the Greek church and somehow the logic seemed acceptable to the most ardent reactionaries in the Council. Perhaps backdoor arm-twisting was again successful.

The day care center HANAC formed in the church basement was holding two classes a day in 1972 with a total of fifty children. The Senior Citizen Center, which was hardly more than a room filled with card tables, attracted the retired men and a few of their wives to the church each day.

Each program was organized and run by non-Greek Human Resource workers with a few Greeks helping to staff the center. HANAC had also set up a language school on Ditmars Boulevard and was slowly attracting non-English speaking Greeks to its evening classes.

If secular programs provided what seemed a source of endless conflict in the church community, theological issues were no less powerful concerns, particularly if they had to do with the use of English. Father Poulos assumed a strong assimilationist stand on both practical and spiritual interests. He urged his supporters and Greeks in general to view America as their homeland. He wanted them to modify their ethnic habits and beliefs to better enable them to participate in American society. The individualism and hard work ethics of Protestant America were viewed as profitable, positive approaches to daily contingencies. He similarly viewed the introduction of English into church liturgies as a positive step towards facilitating not only the assimilation of the immigrant but continued support for Greek Orthodoxy among the American-born children of the Greek immigrant.

The difficulties which this assimilationist position created for Father Poulos became manifest when the Archdiocese announced that English liturgies could be added to church services. The Greek language press assumed a strong position against the new services. Influential community leaders vocalized opposition to these changes. Church meetings and political rallies became arenas for debating the merits of Greek and English in spiritual communion. Despite Father Poulos' own strong beliefs in the importance of English for the Greek's incorporation into America, he was forced to succumb to public pressures. He postponed any planned changes in church liturgy or ritual. The church even had to respond to criticism with an advertisement in the various Greek

newspapers assuring its readers that no such modifications would be made in St. Demitrios' liturgies.

Yet, the more powerful American-born Greeks and their parents objected to this reactionary decision. Some even began to attend St. Nicholas in Flushing, Queens, where English liturgies were held as additions to the Greek ones. Other Greeks spent long hours in Assembly meetings berating the new Greeks for not permiting modifications which would modernize church ceremonies. Some of the newer church members began to advocate these changes as well. Many of their own children were growing impatient with their inabilities to understand church liturgies and were pressuring their parents in subtle ways to make these changes. School lessons were themselves having fewer hours of Greek per week than in earlier years. The use of Greek in religious training also faced modification.

It is difficult to assess precisely which Greeks supported which style of church or which programs advocated by Father Poulos. Certain individuals who seemed to support the priest on certain occasions opposed his decisions on other issues. Most members of the parish, moreover, rarely attended General Assembly meetings. They articulated their sentiments privately, doing little to directly alter the priests' programs. Participation in the General Assembly, as well as in the Parents Teachers Associations was voluntary. An overlap in those attending these groups was visibly evident. Numbers grew and composition shifted, however, depending on the particular evenings' discussion or the nature of business facing the General Assembly meeting. One of the frequent sources of internal dissension within the church structure was the fact that these organizations, which anyone might attend, were less influential, indeed powerless, when compared with the powerful Parish Council. That council

was dominated by Greeks who had lived in the community years longer than the more recent residents, and who had held positions on the Council for many years. They even elected their adult children to the Council. Economically, many of these trustees were financially successful. Several were self-employed; several others were professionals. One was a stockbroker, another an accountant, a third an engineer. One member was a musician, another was president of a large pizza-manufacturing firm; one was a wealthy restaurant owner, and several of the older members were retired waiters and furriers. In 1971, there was only one man who was a relatively new member of the community. He had only lived in Astoria five years and was still working as a waiter. And, he was struggling to maintain some influence on the Council. Stories proliferated about how he had stuffed the ballot boxes at election time. Other tales told of how the old-timers stuffed the boxes to keep the newer Greeks from winning. The contests between these different Greeks for control over the church and its policies remained continuous sources of tension in Council meetings and in the General Assembly. Yet, the newer refugees and immigrants from the post-war period continued to exert increasing pressure on the old-line power bloc. Conflicts, however, often seemed to focus on the nature of power relations between the two groups.

The fact that these newer members insisted on participation in the Parish Council is important to note. They were not willing to simply seek another church where they could perhaps find easier access to power. St. Demitrios symbolized something these Greeks felt worth struggling for; something of their own desire to associate with the older immigrants, with the Greek-Americans, and with the symbols of Americanization and economic success which they might not achieve but which they planned for their children's future.

The number of these Greeks who showed me pictures of their sons and daughters and told me how bright their children were and how they would make great doctors, was enlightening of their own willingness to struggle so their children would excel.

The unifying link drawing all these Greeks and Greek-Americans together at St. Demitrios and separating them from the recently arrived immigrants seems to be their similar experiences in America, their common place in an occupational class position and their shared view of themselves as occupying similar positions in the status hierarchy within the Greek community. These Greeks, regardless, it seemed, of the time at which they immigrated or whether or not they are American-born, considered themselves by virtue of their occupation or income or life style, to be members of the middle-class. Further, while they recognized that differences in prestige and influence within the church community existed, and that the cleavages often reflect the individual's place of birth and length of time of residence in Astoria, all of these Greeks separate themselves from the newly arrived Greeks and from those Greeks who attended "rebel" churches such as St. Markela. Greeks attending St. Demitrios ranked themselves above these other Greeks on the basis of their own superior knowledge of how to be "American," and particularly on their ability to be "middle-class" American, urbane, de-Hellenized, assimilated, and egalitarian. It was this last aspect, their concern with equalizing relations within their own families and with Greeks and non-Greeks outside their families that stood in complete opposition to the asymmetrical relations characterizing Greeks who participated in St. Markela.

This concern with being middle-class and with equalizing relationships between males and females, parents and children, kinsmen and non-kinsmen,

public officials and private individuals, and even between Greeks and non-Greeks perhaps became initially apparent to me in the attendance patterns at St. Demitrios. Women were not the predominant participants in the church. Families were. Men attended church and participated in the rituals alongside their wives and children. Neither was this a priest-dominated church. Layity shared power with the priest in making political, economic and at times, religious decisions.

In observing the relations between husbands and wives of these Greek supporters of St. Demitrios the stereotype of the Greek husband, the domineering, autocratic, superior male, and of the Greek wife--demurring, withdrawing, subordinate and obedient to her husband--was destroyed. There were situations in which such a pattern did appear, i.e., where a husband attempted to impose his idea or decision upon his wife. But, in most cases where I interviewed both spouses, where I had dinner in their homes with both husband and wife, where I went to church with an entire family, women were "fighting" back. Women seemed to be making overt efforts to create more equality, more symmetry, more importance to their roles vis-a-vis their husbands, particularly in public arenas. Associated with this increased equality in male and female stature, there appeared an overlap in the domains which were traditionally segregated, sex-defined spheres of activity. This was evident in both the home and in public settings.

Illustrations of this increasing symmetry or egalitarianism in social relations between husbands and wives (and males and females) appeared in both minor, subtle relationships and in major role definitions. Some of the more subtle shifts in deference and power relations were evident in simply the interviewing situations and the casual conversations held with these informants. In many of these interviews women, wives, were not only asked by the husbands

to stay and participate but were often equal participants, without opposition from their husbands. Interview schedules reflected the increased input of wives in answering questions. Women seemed informed on the nature of relationships between layity and priests. Women were also able to discuss major issues concerning the Greek community itself--such as the problems arising from the influx of new Greeks or the lack of political influence of Greeks in Astoria. They were not only knowledgeable about topics outside their homes but they were not at all embarrassed to offer this information even in front of their husbands--husbands who might traditionally have kept their wives secluded in their homes without access to information dealing with the outside world.

Men, in these situations, were not, at least on the surface, challenged by their wives' knowledge nor overly critical when their wives answered questions. Conversations seemed to flow between family members (even including the children as we will discuss later) and the opinions of women were not discounted nor viewed as threatening to their husband's stature.

As one man, (a refugee from the Greek Civil War) said:

> My wife is a smart woman. She reads a great deal and she likes to discuss these questions with me. She used to teach at the Greek day school before the children were born and some day she will go back to teaching. It's good for her.

This attitude of the man towards his wife's intelligence and towards her holding a job were characteristic of several other couples interviewed. In ten cases of the sixty families interviewed, in fact, the wives worked or had returned to work. Several had held jobs before their children were born, had stayed home while the children were young and were now back working again. In each of these instances the decision of the wife to return to work had been one shared by her husband. In some cases, in fact, the husband had prodded

his wife to return to work. Three women worked at a major department store as sales persons or department managers. Another two women were school teachers. A third was a secretary and a fourth was a hairdresser. Two other women worked in banks as tellers and one other worked in the garment center.

All of these women felt that they had been growing dull and bored sitting at home once their children had gone to school. Their husbands had no objection to their returning to work as long as the children were cared for. Most of the husbands were delighted that the wives could help with the support of the family. Traditional Greek objections to a working wife and commonplace assumptions on the effects of working wives on a husbands "honor" and his male identity seemed, in these instances, to have taken second place or to have disappeared completely. Pragmatic considerations of the wife's happiness and of the need for extra family income--as well as the increasingly equal status of the two spouses--seemed to have taken precedence over more traditional concepts of a woman's proper role in life.

Even in those cases where women did not work, these women still felt that they could participate as equals with their husbands in social spheres and in intellectual discussions. In one home where the woman was a housewife, she nevertheless sat at the table with us and avidly participated in our conversation--even though she had difficulty with the language and needed our interpreter's help on several occasions. She also went bowling with her husband on Saturday evenings and he went to church with her on holidays and occasionally on Sundays.

These women did not simply display in conversational settings their equality with their husbands. They not only worked, but they also socialized with their spouses. Social settings--such as visits with friends, an evening at

the movies, a church dance, or dinner out at a local restaurant--were shared events. Husbands had, on some evenings, events which were still exclusively male-oriented. Some belonged to local mens' clubs (Greek-affiliated and non-Greek oriented clubs). Others went to play cards with the men. But card games were now, more often than not, held in someone's home, not in the local political club house. Men and women shared these domains. An evening's entertainment was a couple's entertainment--not the exclusive domain of the male nor (as we will consider) a primarily kin-oriented occasion.

Further, with this equalization in male and female roles outside the home, male assistance in the home increased--to degrees of course, varying with the personal relationships between a particular husband and wife. Men were not adverse to cleaning up the dishes in several homes where I had dinner. Cleaning the kitchen was a joint affair in which even the children participated. Men did not seem to like the job and most said that they hardly ever did other kinds of housecleaning. They did help with the shopping if a wife was working. They might even help prepare dinners if the woman got home late from work. These tasks were not considered the man's primary responsibility. But neither did they preclude him from helping his wife if she needed it.

The setting in which this overlap of roles and increasing symmetry in the status of these roles is most apparent is in the church and its associated spheres of activity, e.g., the General Assembly, the PTA, and the Parish Council. At St. Demitrios, the women ran the philanthropic arm of the church, the Philoptochos.They were also involved in the PTA and in the development of curriculum and extra-curricula programs at the school. They ran fund-raising drives for the school through the parents' organizations and they ran similar drives through the church organization for the charities, the church building

funds, and other church-related needs.

The women, however, also served as active, full-fledged members of the administrative arms of the church--the General Assembly and the Parish Council. At the time of the study, two women served on the Parish Council. Further, women were not adverse to speaking out at General Assembly meetings or at PTA meetings, even if their adversaries were men. This is not to imply that the woman's influence was equal to or greater than the man's. It was difficult to assess the dynamics of small group encounters to explore precisely how much power these women actually held over male or group decisions. The men did not leave the religious or the administrative concerns of the church to the women or the priests either. Men attended church rituals with the women, but they also attended PTA meetings with the women, and were outspoken in support of policies or programs which effected their children. Further, the men were very active in fund-raising drives, in allocating funds for particular programs, and in directing the religious leadership in changes effecting ritual or religious affairs at the church. The laity immediately involved itself in these secular and spiritual programs. In fact, the laity seemed to try at every point to limit the relative political positions of the religious leadership. Males were active participants in the spiritual activities of the church. The equalization of their positions with the women, and with the clergy, set up domains which each of these males, females, lay and clergy, now controlled according to a new balance in power. As such, each domain became an institutional arena in which combat as well as cooperation between these equals could and did take place. Domination was not clear cut. Hierarchies were not well established. Hence the dynamics of power relations constantly reflected the tensions, as well as the benefits of this equalizing process.

This overlap in social roles and the symmetry emerging between husbands and wives, males and females, priest and laity, were reflected in the attitudes several of these Greeks expressed about the relative importance of male and female children. One man, for example, when he saw that I was pregnant, said: "I suppose you and your husband want a son. All men want sons. But don't worry if it's a girl. I love my daughters, they worm their way into your heart. Sons are wonderful and I'm glad I have one. But don't worry if you have a daughter." Another Greek reassured me, after my daughter was born, that daughters are much less trouble than sons. "Sons are too headstrong," he said.

If males were no longer considered overwhelmingly more important and more domineering than females, and if husbands and wives were achieving an increasing balance in their relative status within and outside their homes, children were also gaining recognition as individuals with the ability to participate in family decisions concerning themselves. To suggest that young children were gaining "power" or influence over their parents is perhaps too extreme. Children still remained subject to the wishes of their parents. In fact, through childhood and until adolescence, parents dealt with their children firmly and without much consideration of the child's whims. If children were asked to leave the room, they were expected to obey, and usually did. If they were supposed to practice their musical instrument, they were usually, if not always, found practicing. If they were asked to turn the television set off, sometimes they did and sometimes they objected. The dialogues were certainly not without some debate or objection on the part of the children. Nonetheless, parental wishes with children, up to college age, were usually accepted as the way it will be done.

In discussing parental attitudes towards the rights of children, however,

particularly with parents of children approaching teen years or already in adolescence, many of the parents felt that their children were much more worldly and intelligent, and able to convince their parents of the merits of their interests and wishes, than the parents had been with their own parents. Grandparents, in several cases, refused to believe or condone how lenient their own children were with the grandchildren. The grandchildren, they felt, ruled the roost--demanding even the food they wanted to eat and when they wanted dinner. Separate meals were never a part of the grandparents' generation.

Children, moreover, were frequent participants in our discussions. They interpreted questions for their parents or grandparents. If they could add a piece of information on a cousin or a friend, they felt no reluctance about adding it. Parents occasionally reprimanded the children for interfering but, more often than not, the children joined us at the table, adding interesting bits and pieces of information, and were apparently considered equal representatives of the family.

The idea that the child should leave school to contribute to the family's income or that the family's interests were more important than those of the child were considered old-fashioned. Children and their parents were, in general, career oriented. While fathers were in many cases working or lower middle-class in occupation, e.g., waiters, furriers, florists, almost all wanted their children to pursue white collar, preferably professional careers. Doctors, lawyers, engineers and dentists were the best. Teachers and self-employed businessmen were less prestigious careers, even if the self-employed entrepreneur was perhaps financially more successful than the lawyer or the dentist. Those parents who were already professionals assumed that their children would similarly pursue college educations and professional occupations. The future

independence and success of the child was considered more crucial than the possible immediate gratifications of the parents. Of course, these were generally families in which an adequate income already existed --either through the father's job or the joint income of both husband and wife. Many families had second homes or vacationed in the Catskills or on Long Island for the summer. The immediate sacrifices of the children for the family were hardly necessary. If familial denial was necessary it usually referred to peripheral luxury items--a new car or a new couch--not to basics, such as rent or food. That parents could be indulgent and not demanding of their children is perhaps an important point.

Marriage decisions and post-marital residence patterns were another area in which the relaxation of parental controls over children's decisions were evident. Sons and daughters of college age or in their early twenties felt, in general, that their parents hoped that they would select a spouse who was preferably Greek and at least middle-class. Parental influence in the selection of a spouse was just that, influence, not complete control. Arranged marriages were considered, by both parents and children, to be old-fashioned and reprehensible. Most parents of these children felt that their own lives had been selected for them by their parents and they didn't want to do the same to their children. They were, as a group, not unhappy with their spouses. But, most felt that their children should be able to select a marriage partner because they liked them, not because their parents had arranged their marriage.

Residence after marriage, moreover, was also expected to reflect the children's ability to decide where they wanted to live and what kind of life style they wanted to pursue. Some mothers hoped that their daughters and sons would live close to home. Several daughters and sons felt that it would

be good to live near their parents, particularly for baby sitting purposes. But the decision making process rested as much with the children as with the parents.

Friendship and kinship was another sphere in which the Greeks were attempting to balance relationships. Friends assumed an equivalent position to that of kinsmen in the lives of Greeks attending St. Demitrios. When these informants were asked to evaluate the relative importance of kinsmen and friends in their daily lives as well as in their social, economic and spiritual relations, most stressed that they were, in varying degrees, becoming more dependent on friends than on kinsmen for instrumental and effective support. This seemed clearly apparent in the interviews and in the descriptions of relations with kinsmen and non-kinsmen. It was also clearly different from the traditional Greek dependence on kinsmen and reluctance to interact with non-kinsmen.

In contrast to the privacy maintained by Greeks traditionally, the Greeks interviewed invariably called over a friend or several friends to join our conversations. At times this was in response to my suggestion; at other times, the informant offered to invite in his or her friends. One informant invited three neighbors in to lunch with me; another couple invited two other couples for an evening of coffee and dessert. Several informants were willing to call and arrange interviews for me with their friends. And all of those interviewed could list at least three names of people who they felt were sufficiently close friends that they could help with my research. In only one instance was a relative invited over for either lunch, dessert or to join our interview. It almost seemed as if there were certain things which were all right to share with strangers and friends but not with family. My interviews were one of those things.

When asked about this relationship with friends, several of my informants commented that they try not to socialize with family members except on holidays or occasionally on Sunday afternoons. They also try not to go away on vacations with relatives. Some had summer homes on Mattituck near other kinsmen. Most tried, in spite of this proximity, to avoid frequent socializing with these relatives. Instead, they prefered to share a house with friends, go to a movie with friends, even sit in church with friends.

Business relations were also considered too critical to involve kinsmen. "If you work for a kinsmen," said one informant, "you are a slave. You can't ask for a raise and you can't leave without disrupting the entire family. It makes no sense to get involved with relatives." Said another informant, "Am I glad that my mother-in-law moved away. There was always tension in our house when she popped in. I wanted a little privacy. But you can't get it with relatives." Several informants who owned restaurants, in fact, said that they tried to avoid hiring kinsmen unless it was absolutely necessary. "They never worked very hard," one said, "and you couldn't fire them."

Friends, on the other hand, you could pick and choose. You could leave a friend without family squabbles. Most felt that they never wanted to work with a friend any more than they wanted to work with a relative. But for after work social life and for sharing common interests, friends were more compatible than relatives who only shared a common ancestry with you.

This difficulty arose frequently among those Greeks who sponsored a relative and his family to immigrate to America. One case in particular proved a source of endless conflict. A stockbroker, Mr. J., had invited his brother, director of a weaving mill, to come to America with his wife and 3 daughters. The brother expected to live with Mr. J. until he could afford his

own home. The only job he could find was that of an assembly-line worker in a small factory, earning just above the minimum wage. He could hardly afford to move into a house or an apartment large enough for his family. He refused to allow his wife to work. He stubbornly insisted that Mr. J.'s sons escort his daughters wherever they went and he paid nothing to help with the food and expenses. Socially, he kept looking for tavernas where he could get away from the women. His wife and Mr. J.'s wife (who was American born) constantly fought over control of the kitchen and over housekeeping responsibilities. Finally, they moved the family to another brother's house.

Preferences for one or the other side in a family were random. Individuals seemed to pick and choose from among those relatives who were about the same age. Those who were socially appealing to an individual were converted into friends. Those who were not were seen on Sundays and holidays and family affairs, and hence remained kinsmen.

If friends had lost their status as strangers and if kinsmen had become subject to the same kind of scrutiny that strangers and friends had been before, the world order had shifted away from one hierarchically arranged into spheres of kin and non-kin into one which was egalitarian in stature and maintained through individual decision-making. Individual concerns became more crucial than kinship group interests. The flexibility of friendships assumed greater saliency and viability than the rigidity of kinship.

In only a few instances did I have the opportunity to view these Greeks at their businesses or place of work. Those cases where I did observe them were very varied and not representative of the total range of jobs in which these Greeks were employed. As a result, generalizations are difficult to draw from the data.

If we could suggest a possible trend, however, one thing stands out clearly: in many instances these Greeks either were independently employed, were employed in managerial positions, or were professionals. Those who were employed by companies or law firms, or in restaurants or for newspapers were not, generally speaking, assembly line or blue collar workers. Their jobs as stockbrokers or attorneys, interior decorators or hairdressers, engineers or newspaper reporters, small manufacturers or furriers, were positions in which they were in control of themselves and of others. They were not the underdogs but the overlords, and their view of their positions reflected this fact. They did not express feelings of being controlled by the whims of others but rather of controlling their own lives and even the lives of others. They were in the higher power positions, not the lower ones in the hierarchy. As such their relations in and perspectives on their positions suggested that these men were not obsessed by their inequality but rather that they were pleased by their power and independence, and perhaps even by their equality. They were in symmetrical positions in dealing with the world--in control, not controlled by others. They had skills, trades, things which they could market if they lost their jobs. They were secure in their occupations and pleased with their futures.

Members of St. Demitrios conceptualized their relationships with the outside world as a team-like effort in which they, as individuals were active, or passive, but certainly equal participants. Abstract concepts such as political "parties" or a social class or a community were understandable to Greeks at St. Demitrios. Individuals could express an identification with an abstract political party such as Republicans or Democrats and view their relationship with the party itself, not with a personal political leader or a patron within the party. They similarly viewed themselves as participants in the General

Assembly of the church. They did not consider themselves as personal clients of or patrons to the church or its leaders and often resented when they felt the priest was trying to call in obligations based, in their minds, on hypothetical patron-client personal types of relationships. Relationships were not personally defined but corporately conceived.

These collective conceptualizations of membership in a larger abstraction beyond family and kinship groups was clearly expressed in the responses of these Greeks to the behavior of new Greeks who sought special favors because of personal linkage. The young politician who had taken over the political leadership of the Aldos Democratic Club was met with negative reviews by the Greeks from St. Demitrios. His tactics were irritating. He attempted, they felt, to sell his patronage in return for personal support. He gave away jobs not on the basis of merit but on whether or not he could get fiscal or political support from an individual. These Greeks recognized that much of New York politics operates as a patronage system of personal politics. Yet, they objected to the denial of party politics and meritocracy, where equality of votes and competency replaced traditional values of preferential treatment and personal influence.

In another similar illustrative situation many of the Greeks were important initiators of city funded, church supported agencies and programs with which the problems of the new immigrants could be handled--impersonally and without individual patronage coming into play. Many of the new immigrants for whom these programs were designed did not bother to participate in them. Many did not even realize that they existed. Those Greeks who used the Senior Citizens Center were not newcomers (most of whom had little time for such a center to begin with) but older Greeks who had lived in Astoria for decades and who now had a public

place in the church to play cards or watch television with friends in the afternoons. Most, if not all, were retired and had little else to do with their days. The women who brought their children to the nursery were, by and large, not new immigrants but women from the refugee period or American-born Greeks of early immigrant parents. In other words, these organized programs to help the newcomer were conceptually suited to the world of the older immigrants and Greek-Americans, not to those Greeks who had just recently immigrated from Greece. The newcomers were still visualizing the world in traditional, individualistic, hierarchically organized ways where personal ties provided the sole access to resources beyond those controlled by kin and family. HANAC and other agencies, Greek and non-Greek affiliated were well structured to suit the needs of those who founded and operated them, not those who needed (supposedly) them.

If we reflect upon the priest, the church, and the parishioners associated with St. Demitrios, there emerges a dominant motif articulated through the behavioral patterns, architectural forms and value orientations of the church community. Father Poulos is portrayed and perceived by his constituents as a materialistic, secularized, American-oriented priest. His religious attitudes, particularly his Ecumenicism and his efforts to introduce language modifications in church rituals, are clearly consistent with the stated aims of the Archdiocese to seek linkages between Greek Orthodoxy and other religious denominations, particularly the powerful Protestant and Roman Catholic ones, in America. These philosophical positions are equally important expressions of Father Poulos' commitment to bring his parish and parishioners into mainstream America and into the highly competitive arena in which America's major religious institutions are involved. The priest's practical policies, programs and

methods for financing and instituting these plans, symbolize to parishioners his skill as a businessman and political manipulator--or, as his parishioners commented, Father Poulos' skills as a man. His choice of dress style, hair style, the absence of a beard, and his gestures and patterns of speech further suggest appropriate external signifiers of the priest's increasing concern with himself as a successful American man. Traditional ambiguity over the Greek's image of a priest as a half-man/half-woman seem resolved in the elimination of the long skirts, long beards, and selfless, demeaning mannerisms of Old World priests. Without these ambiguities, Father Poulos seems far more controllable to his parishioners. His spiritual sources of power seem diminished. His economic and political base for control seem ineffective. Rather than control, Father Poulos manipulates his skills as an influential equal among a parish of competitors seeking his legitimation as an indicator of their own personal prestige.

Father Poulos represents to his parishioners a public expression of their own particular values, goals, and strategies for pursuing those goals. Spiritual issues rarely concern church members. Sources of controversy stem essentially from efforts to allocate church funds for particular secular or social programs. Other conflicts generally emerge over educational issues. The underlying concern among supporting and dissenting factions in the parish is the implications of particular programs or policies for their future economic and educational success and that of their children.

One can hardly discern clean lines dividing the church community into social cliques or political factions. Older immigrants and newcomers (post-1965 immigrants) do not seem to form any common community. Refugees tend to appear as integrated members of the Greek-American and old-immigrant sectors of the parish. Yet, on particular issues, linkages between new immigrants

and refugees emerge, isolating these Greeks from their American-born counterparts. Permanent factions are not typically part of the church community. The one thread tying the entire membership into a cohesive body, at least to outsiders, is a general acknowledgement of their own desire to see their children become even more successful as members of mainstream America.

Clearly indicative of this commitment to middle-class values and an American way of life is the structural design of secular uses for which the new building was clearly conceived. Behavior during church rituals are similarly suggestive of this commitment to either mainstream America or to middle-class codes of conduct, or to both.

In sum, we move away from St. Demitrios towards the rebellious St. Markela with the feeling that we are leaving America and entering the traditional world of village Greece. Yet, the two churches are but blocks apart in the midst of essentially the same Greek and Greek-American community.

Chapter IV

Priests and Parishes: Bishop Petros and St. Markela

When I first asked Father Poulos about the "rebel" priests and splinter churches, as they were called by members of St. Demitrios, I was thrust a sheet of paper with the name of a priest and a church on it. "This is one of those phony 'rebel' churches," said Father Poulos, with great anger and agitation. "One of my parishioners came up to me last week and thanked me for sponsoring bingo games down on 31st Street. We don't sponsor any bingo games in Astoria. When I asked her who told her it was St. Demitrios' bingo, she said 'oh, the nice priest who runs it.' "

"Since any four people can come together and legally form a church, complained Father Poulos, "a man can simply buy a set of robes or a clerical collar, ordain himself a priest and then run bingo games in a rented hall in the name of a phony church. All he is doing is stealing money in the name of religion. That is a 'rebel' church."

These were Father Poulos' impressions of the growing number of rebel churches operating in Astoria. By 1962 there were already an estimated eleven such schismatic churches (HANAC report, 1972). While the priest was critical of the people who formed these churches, and of those who supported them, he often had to solve the problems which these "rebel" priests could not handle. Members of St. Markela, for example, frequently appeared at St. Demitrios to seek help adopting children in Greece so they could obtain relative visas for them into America. Others came for help in jobs or to receive special charity when they were ill. As Sophia, the church secretary said, "of course Father Poulos helped these people. He knew the right people to contact and

he had influential friends to take care of the problems. Why would anyone go to these 'rebel' churches? What could these 'rebel' priests do for them? Besides, these churches are so old-fashioned."

Some of the rebel churches were, in fact, phony fronts which only appeared for bingo games. Others, particularly St. Markela, were legitimate religious institutions with their primary intent to fulfill the spiritual needs of the Greek community. St. Markela was among the more successful, measured in numerical terms, of these "rebel" churches, and the one which seemed most threatening to the priest at St. Demitrios. Influential Greek leaders in Astoria were commenting on the growing numbers of Greeks attending Sunday mass at St. Markela. Non-Greek political leaders were interested in the increasing influence of Bishop Petros, St. Markela's spiritual leader, among the new Greek immigrants settling in Astoria. Older members of St. Demitrios were distraught by the fact that relatives, newly arrived from Greece, often found St. Markela more to their liking than St. Demitrios.

History of the Church

St. Markela was not simply another church affiliated with the Archdiocese and yet attracting a different segment of the Greek community. Theologically, politically, socially and symbolically it divided itself from the "established" St. Demitrios community and from the parent church, the Archdiocese of North and South America. The Bishop founded St. Markela in 1954. After the war, he had been invited to New York from Greece by St. John's Church in Manhattan where he served for several years as a pastor. In 1954, he bought a small house in Astoria on 26th Street and formed St. Markela. Six years later he bought the adjoining buildings to house his monastery. In 1962, he was ordained a

Bishop. Over the past decade he has trained more than a dozen priests and several still operate churches affiliated with St. Markela. One affiliate is located in Bethpage, Long Island; another is in the Catskills. Two more are in Montreal and Chicago.

The division between Bishop Petros' form of Greek Orthodoxy and that practiced by St. Demitrios and endorsed by the Archdiocese was based on several key interpretational differences involving theological and political issues. The original separation between Bishop Petros and the established church occurred in 1924 in Greece over the question of which religious calendar the Greek Orthodox Church would follow. Dominant forces at that time switched the Greek Orthodox community over to the Gregorian calendar of Roman Catholicism. Dissidents, such as those the Bishop supported, adhered to the traditional Julian Calendar. Implicit in the division over calendrical issues, however, was the Bishop's concern with the growing movement in Greek Orthodoxy towards amelioration of differences with Roman Catholicism. While the Bishop believed in a unified church, catholic in its broadest meaning, he rejected any prospects of reuniting Christendom under Roman domination. The original 1,000 years of Christianity, he says, were united under Greek rule. That was the way it should continue. Associated with this form of Ecumenicism under Roman domination was the threat of modernism in church liturgies. Purity in Orthodox dogma stemmed from the original forms of church rituals and the task of the religious scholar, and the religious leader was to return to those pure forms. Within them religious believers could once again find spiritual fulfillment. The use of the vernacular, in this case English, in the liturgy was not the issue, as Bishop Petros felt the Archdiocese perceived it to be. Rather, the Greek Orthodox Church traditionally used the vernacular in its liturgies. What was

important was that traditional rites, such as immersion for baptism, were not "modernized" into simply a sprinkling of holy water, which would then distort the original meaning of the ritual itself.

The Bishop originally affiliated his church with the Patriarch of Alexandria. Political issues, however, about which he refused to speak, led to his separation from Alexandria. In 1972 he was head of an independent church under his own jurisdiction, proselytizing his message in Greek communities throughout the United States.

The Bishop

My first sight of the Bishop was as striking to me as my first encounter with Father Poulos but in a dramatically different way. On my first visit the Bishop was sitting in front of this church watching children play. Surrounding him were the nuns, shrouded in black and hardly visible from beneath their long black scarves. The Bishop, dressed in the long skirts of traditional Greek Orthodox priests, was hidden behind a long white beard, carefully combed into place. His grey hair, long and tied in a bun behind his head, was topped with the traditional hard black hat. He seemed very massive, yet he was short in height--much as Father Poulos had appeared. In very different ways, these religious leaders both projected dynamic, oversized statements of themselves. Informants frequently referred to the Bishop's "power" and "strength," his certainty and sacred wisdom. Even sitting in front of the church watching the children play, he created a sense of enormous certainty and security. The priest, the monk and the deacon who assist the Bishop and proselytize his message also conveyed some of the Bishop's sense of spiritual self-confidence in their stature and mannerisms. They too wore the long skirts, the long beards and the long hair of traditional Greek Orthodox priests. Indeed, the deacon was much apologetic

that he had to shave off his beard. He had married and had to work as a waiter. His employer thought that it was inappropriate for him to wear a long flowing beard while he was serving soup.

The reactions of these religious leaders to me and to my inquiries about his church were quite different from those of Father Poulos and parishioners at St. Demitrios. Instead of the extensive interest Father Poulos had shown in my research, neither the Bishop nor his staff were at all interested in what I was doing. I was almost an imposition upon them and they frequently disappeared before my interviews or pleaded ignorance when I discussed something with them in English. (Yet, they often understood enough English to correct me when I made the wrong conclusion or when another Greek was trying to explain some aspect of the rituals of the church to me.)

My status began to change, however, when I began to attend church every Sunday. I had originally told them that I was studying the problems of the Greek immigrant in the United States. This seemed totally immaterial to the Bishop and he consequently ignored my efforts to probe into his dealings with newly immigrated Greeks. When, however, I became interested in the rituals and beliefs of his Orthodox church, the Bishop became extraordinarily interested in me. I had become a potential convert! "Ah, this poor Jew," as he and his parishioners often responded to my inquiries. "Now she will see the light, the Orthodox light." Theirs, they assured me, was the "pure" form of Orthodoxy. This was a real Orthodox church. Watch closely, they advised me, and I will see the correct way to perform the rituals by a spiritually enriched religious leader. After the kinds of responses I had received to my Judaic ancestry at St. Demitrios, I was perplexed by the serious concern people expressed, often with blunt contempt, over my religious background. Members of St.

Markela insisted that I celebrate Holy Week with them and that I not miss the elaborate festivities at Easter time. At Easter, the entire street, they beamed, fills with people. Candles are lit at the altar and passed slowly through silent crowds until the church, the courtyard and the entire street become a blaze of light, solemn yet joyous. The same ritual is performed at St. Demitrios, yet no one there ever seemed interested in my seeing it or understanding its significance. They were more concerned about alleviating their embarrassment over the boisterous display of fireworks set off on Easter Eve by the rambunctious adolescents and particularly by the rude newcomers.

The Church

When I first drove up to St. Markela I missed the church in among the rows of attached two-story homes which stretched along the block on either side of it. Across the street was a small, darkened-window, taverna. On the stoops sat several children playing street games. In the taverna one could barely see the many men sitting around tables with coffee and cards.

The converted row house which serves as both church and school for St. Markela is, at first glance, virtually indistinguishable from the other buildings surrounding it. The building's exterior design and interior decorations clearly separate it from St. Demitrios and particularly from St. Demitrios' new branch, SS. Catherine and George--which is located but a few blocks away. St. Markela's entrance is marked by a black, wrought iron fence surrounding a church courtyard which leads to a flight of stairs and the heavy wooden doors of the building. The stucco faced front of the building, its peaked roof, and the cross atop the building are the only signs which visibly mark the building as a church and separate it from the adjacent homes and the small shops across the street. On the door is a sign warning women to dress appropriately: no

slacks, shorts, short skirts or bared arms are permitted inside. The courtyard serves as the playground for the children attending the nursery school and as a veranda for the Bishop, priests and nuns to sit, chat and watch the mothers pushing shopping carts and baby carriages home. Attached to the church are the grey buildings which house the Bishop, and his staff. The Bishop proudly showed me these living quarters, pointing out the hard beds and limited comforts of his monastic existence.

Not only is the church exterior hardly distinguishable from the facades of the houses adjacent to it, but the interior of the church is hardly more than 20' x 40' converted living room with adjacent space in the adjoining house. The sanctuary occupies one end of the room. The altar is elaborately decorated with icons, many of which the Bishop painted himself. The large Bishop's chair stands abruptly, and seemingly oversized for the room, on the right side of the altar. Crowded in and around the religious sanctuary are the scattered folding chairs which begin each Sunday in carefully arranged rows but which end up pushed into oddly shaped configurations by the time the crowds of worshippers leave the service. The red altar and the illumination of the candles and golden iconography are set against the stark institutional green of the adjacent walls. The walls are covered with the scattered blackboards, maps and pictures of the Bishop and of Greece, all part of the classroom into which the religious sanctuary is converted after Sunday Mass. When Mass is over and the lights around the icons are turned off, the entire room becomes secularized once again. Once Sunday comes, however, the lights flicker and the candles burn, creating a highly sacred sanctuary out of the dull room.

Members of St. Markela attend this small church precisely because they enjoy the intense physical contact between worshippers. On a typical

Sunday, several hundred Greeks, some with children on their shoulders or in their arms, crowd in around the folding chairs, pushing as close to the Bishop and priests as they can reach. Moving up to the altar to kiss the icons proves increasingly difficult as the crowd intensifies. On nice days and particularly on holidays, the loud speakers are turned on so the overflow crowds in the courtyard can hear the Mass. The physical space inside the church is limited, but, to members of the church, the spatial proximity to each other and to the religious leaders, and to the spiritual sanctuary communicates an emotional intensity and a spiritual purity which is stimulating, fulfilling, and which cannot be achieved at St. Demitrios. The lack of order, space and distance is positively valued. Emotional expression during rituals heightens participant involvement in the message of the ritual and in the sense of community.

The distinctions made by members of St. Markela's between their brand of Orthodoxy and that of St. Demitrios extended beyond the questions of calendars, rituals, and religious compromise. When you ask a member of the congregation why they attend St. Markela and not SS. Catherine and George which is across the street from where they live, they say, "because SS. Catherine and George isn't really an Orthodox church." It's a modern church, and on the outside a beautiful one, perhaps. But on the inside, they say, there is much difference between the warmth, the love, the depth of the religion you feel at St. Markela's and the cold, distant, mechanistic rituals which are performed at St. Demitrios or SS. Catherine and George. At St. Markela, you are physically closer to the Bishop and the priests. He is almost touching you physically and emotionally. His eyes are close to yours. The chanting is more beautiful, the services more personal.

When I asked my informants to articulate what they disliked about

St. Demitrios and its priests, they repeatedly referred to the passing of plates for money collections. "Collecting money seemed so business-like at St. Demitrios." "But," I added, "they pass the plates as often at St. Markela despite the fact that the Bishop and priests do not have a salary and the schools are supposed to support the church. Why don't you object here?" "Its different here. The priests and Bishops aren't always asking for money. You give because they need it to keep the church going. There aren't frivolous expenses. We aren't always being asked to do this or join that. What we do we want to do. The Bishop and the priests are so devoted to the church, it is the only thing we can do is to help with money."

The other thing church members disliked was the cold impersonality of St. Demitrios. One woman complained that her children weren't allowed to kiss the icons and light the candles because they were told that children are too young to understand and they only hold up the people behind them. Another parishioner commented that the priests at St. Demitrios are always so distant from you. You sit in formal pews while the priests are on the stage above and beyond your reach, socially and spiritually. Maybe it is the priests themselves, one parishioner at St. Markela suggested: "The priests at St. Demitrios are clean shaven and cut their hair short. They don't seem to look like priests and they don't act like them, either. They are always thinking like businessmen, asking you for money and to work on committees. They have no respect for the sacred role of the church. They have dances in church buildings and then they try to get up on Sundays and act like priests."

Secular Programs and Spiritual Strategies

Bishop Petros offers his community several programs which are similar to those sponsored by St. Demitrios. Their intended functions, however, are

much different. St. Markela runs a nursery school program during weekday mornings and a Sunday School religious program, with over 200 students. There is a womens' charity organization, the Philoptochos and a Parish Council, of sorts. The Bishop's view of these programs and structures is revealing of his intentions. They are necessary to his religious mission. His nursery program is steeped in religious tradition. Students are encouraged to bring potential converts to Sunday School. The nuns are trained to educate the non-believer and the Priests and monks view themselves as healers and exorcisers of the devil, should it steal into your soul.

The Bishop's view of the Philoptochos and the Parish Council was that they existed to assist him in this spiritual adventure. The Parish Council had responsibility for the church buildings, but the men, and there were very few who participated, demurred to the Bishop's policies and looked to him for direction and leadership. The ladies sponsored holiday luncheons and assisted in the school programs.

The Bishop originally purchased his church and continues to support it through the sale of icons which he paints. The Bishop's spiritual importance, to some degree, rests on the Orthodox tradition that the icons he paints are "not made by hands." An icon is not the work of an "artist" or of human creative imagination. Rather, Orthodoxy believes that icons are manifestations of heavenly archtypes, a self-made imprint of a saint or of the Virgin or of Christ. The procedure of painting icons is a liturgical act with a high degree of holiness and sanctification demanded of the painter. The painter monks prepare themselves for their task by fasting and penance. Tools are consecrated before they are used. To each spot inside the church certain icons are assigned and the sanctuary, the iconostasis and the dome are adorned. Each family

has an icon in its home and guests are supposed to greet the icon before greeting the host. Each day and each feast has its own special icon which corresponds to established prayers and liturgical texts (Benz, 1957).

While the Bishop's holiness increases with his religious iconography, his church is assisted today by the Parish Council's sale of raffles and Sunday sale of candles. These the Bishop agrees to run only because it permits him to devote more time to his religious training, teaching, and painting.

From the perspective of the parishioner attending St. Markela, the Bishop's efforts to support the church and operate his programs are those of a self-sacrificing religious man. He is spiritual and his efforts are for the sake of his parishioners and his God. Parishioners often express their gratitude by purchasing one dollar candles with ten dollar bills, or ten-cent candles with one dollar bills. While plates are passed several times during church services, once for the Philoptochos, once for a charitable cause, once for the church itself, parishoners contribute without complaint.

The Parishioners

During my early field work at St. Markela I was immediately aware of the overwhelming predominance of Greek women and children attending the church. On Sunday mornings, I would arrive early at the church with the first Greeks, the older Greek women. Dressed in their long black skirts and dark scarves, these old women looked as if they had just been transplanted from a small village in rural Greece. Occasionally, an old women was accompanied by her husband or driven to church by her son. Typically, perhaps as often as not, the husband would say goodbye and spend his mornings elsewhere, and the son would sit in his car or drive away until church services were over and he could pick his mother up for the trip home. By nine or nine-thirty on Sunday

mornings, mothers began to arrive with their children. On nice days, most mothers walked their children to church and stayed with them during services. Older children usually attended the religious services held in adjoining buildings during early parts of the mass. Later, the children rejoined their mothers in the church to participate in Communion or complete the mass. Children were neatly dressed. Their mothers, while neat and clean, wore simple dark dresses or skirts, unstylish and unsophisticated. The styles and lengths of their clothes, their fabric coats (occasionally with fur collars), their simple hair-combs, set them in stark contrast to the more urbane, sophisticated dress of the ladies attending St. Demitrios or SS. Catherine and George. In the midst of this mass of women and children stood a few older men. A few had their children or grandchildren with them. In proportion to the numbers of older Greek women, the numbers of men were small. On one Sunday close to Easter, a time of increasing involvement in church ceremonies, there were only five older men in the middle of thirty or more women of approximately the same age during an early part of the ceremony. The discrepancies between numbers of men and women in this older category of Greeks might reflect simply the differential life spans of males and females. There were fewer men in the church because fewer men were still alive. Similar proportions of males and females, however, seemed to exist in all age groups. Among the more middle-aged Greeks attending the church, there were still very few men compared with the numbers of women. Men and women with children or of child-bearing age (20-40 age group), showed similar disparities in the proportions of both sexes. There did seem to be more men in this age group than in any other. On several Sundays, there were as many as eight or nine men and around Easter and Christmas, almost fifteen. But the number of women on these same Sundays was so

overwhelming that, if the men didn't stand in the rear of the church, I might not have known they were there at all.

The men, as the women, were dressed in jackets and shirts which were typical of village Greece, not of urban America. Most men wore white shirts, often with open necks or muted neckties. Their jackets seemed oversized and their shoes were typically European in design. Haircuts were neat and trim. Some of the men wore mustaches. No one wore a beard.

Their traditional distinctiveness was perhaps most dramatically emphasized when two Greek-American families came to church one Sunday. The behavior of these obviously American-bred, English-speaking, fashionably dressed Greeks immediately identified them as strangers to this church. They did not know to wait to be seated by the ushers, nor in which part of the church they might generally find seats among Greeks in their same age group. They first tried to walk to the front of the church where all the older women sat. There were no seats up there and a sizeable number of subtle conversations took place over the rudeness of these people taking seats from the older people in the front of the church. They did not know where to buy candles nor how to kiss the icons--a pattern of behavior ritually performed every Sunday by most Greeks without any difficulty, any questions or any doubts. The two women who came were dressed in high heels and short-skirted dresses. The dresses were brightly colored and obviously expensive and sophisticated. Their hairdos were professionally combed, stylish coiffures. Their husbands wore bright colored shirts with patterned ties. Their suits were expensive, well tailored and conservatively styled. The two adolescent boys who came with these two families obviously differed from their Greek counterparts. Their long hair and sport jackets, which looked like they had long been outgrown, were quite typical of American

teenagers and not anything like that of the Greek boys standing nearby in the church. The presence of these Greek-Americans in the midst of the obviously different kind of Greeks highlighted the contrasts between the St. Markela community and other Greeks living in Astoria.

The Bishop, priests and parishioners were well aware that very few men attended St. Markela. In past years, they told me, even fewer men participated in the religious aspects or the operational concerns of the church. St. Markela attracted primarily women, and usually older women. The church maintains no records of membership or participation, so we cannot determine how many people attended the church over past years nor how many were men or women. Parishioners and members of the church's Philoptochos Society commented that the number of people attending church services had remained small through the early 1960's. Only after the influx of new immigrants and the movement of Greek refugees from the central city to Astoria did the number of Greeks participating in church ceremonies grow. Today, on a typical Sunday, 150-200 Greeks crowd into the church. On special holidays, several hundred Greeks crowd the building, the adjoining courtyard and the sidewalks on both sides of the church building.

The church today, however, is growing not with refugees but with new Greek immigrants. Priests recognize that the sudden growth in the church reflects the rapid influx of new Greeks in the late 1960's. The ushers were new immigrants; many of the younger women attending the church were new immigrants. Even some of the middle-aged men standing in the rear of the church were recently arrived immigrants. Parishioners, particularly the older refugees, welcomed the new immigrants and encouraged their involvement in the church. The church nursery and religious school have grown as a result

of the new immigration. The church has had to install loudspeakers outside so that parishioners can hear services on special holidays. Church coffers have expanded and the stature of the church in the larger community has improved.

The economic composition and attitudes of participants in St. Markela reflect the fact that many of them are newly arrived from Greece. Most of the Greek women I spoke with said that their husbands worked in some aspect of the restaurant business. Some were waiters in the larger hotels, others worked in small diners. A few were chefs in small restaurants in the city. The deacon of the church was a waiter. The usher, on the other hand, worked as a plumber. Another man, whose wife came often to the church with her children, was a mechanic in a local garage. The husband of another churchgoer worked in Macy's. Very few of the women worked at all. One woman worked as a seamstress in a local garment factory while another worked as a seamstress for a local tailor. Among all the people I spoke with, I could not find professionals or owners of small businesses. Most of the people interviewed, moreover, rented their homes.

Very few of those Greeks who had come over during the 1950's held better paying or more skilled occupations than these newly arrived Greeks. In fact, the general impression one received from discussions with members of the church community was that this was an economically homogeneous group of Greeks. Regardless of whether they were newcomers or refugees, they had neither skills nor great successes. They held jobs and earned a living but these weren't entrepreneurs, or skilled craftsmen, or professional people.

Further, these were Greeks who felt that they belonged to the superior Greek Orthodox Church. They were members of the spiritual elite among Greeks in the community. They were preserving traditions and pure Orthodoxy in the midst

of corrupting assimilating influences. At the same time, they felt that they were being "short-changed," abused, injured by other Greeks. Several new immigrants were distraught by the fact that they could not use skills and training they had learned in Greece to work in higher paying jobs in the United States. They were despondent over the fact that they held lower status positions in America than they had in Greece. One woman told me how her husband had managed a sweater factory in Greece but had emigrated at the urging of his brother, as well as to eliminate the problem of dowering two daughters and fighting the employer all the time. Here in the United States, she complained, her husband could only find work as a machine operator, like those he had supervised back in Greece. Another Greek had held a prestigious position in the civil service. In New York, he now worked as a waiter after starting as a dishwasher in a small diner. Another accountant I spoke with was unemployed. Not only were these new Greeks disillusioned with the occupations they had to accept here but they resented being exploited both by employers who often kept them off the books and by landlords who frequently raised the rents for small apartments in deteriorating buildings. Without legal advice, few of these Greeks felt they had any recourse or control over their lives. With their limited command of the English language, they often did not even realize that channels existed for them to protect themselves from exorbitant rate hikes or exploitive employers. Even immigration lawyers, hired by relatives to help immigrants pass citizenship examinations, charged high fees and often failed to appear at citizenship hearings. Women felt they were particularly exploited in many of the small garment manufacturing shops which, with the rapidly expanding immigrant population, were springing up in Astoria.

Further, these Greeks have often felt abused and insulted when they

attended St. Demitrios or SS. Catherine and George. The other Greeks, they feel, have treated them in church like many have been treated at work--with contempt and ridicule. Those who have tried to enter the political structure of the church, who have tried to participate in the General Assembly or speak up at meetings, find that they are ignored or repudiated.

Whether these claims are true or not is less than important. What is important is that these Greeks feel powerless. They have not achieved either control over their own lives nor a sense of prestige and self-esteem. They have no power or status.

Males and Females

Among Greeks attending St. Markela, the nature of social relationships between males and females, parents and children, husbands and wives, as well as between priests and parishioners, seem to reflect a view of the world clearly different from that perceived by members of St. Demitrios. The Greeks attending St. Markela seem to view the world as one hierarchically ordered with individuals competing for control over others. Their evaluation of the relative positions of males and females, and all social roles associated with sexual differences, reflects this hierarchical order. Rights and responsibilities differ according to sex and age. Males dominate females in certain spheres of activity. Females control and exclude males from others. Shared spheres are rare and these generate moments of potential disorder. As a general rule, secular concerns of the family are controlled by the male. Spiritual concerns are left to the female. Secular problems are viewed as more basic, primary, and important than spiritual ones. Yet, women skillfully use spiritual needs to provide sources of power to offset the pragmatic dependence of females on males.

The separation of normative statements about proper role behavior from actual behavior is difficult. Formal behavior presented in front of interviewers and strangers does not reveal actions performed in private. Informant discussions about their conceptualizations of the world order, and reflections on how people act in that order provide limited but useful insight into possible behavior patterns. Since it is our purpose here to articulate our informants' images of reality--perhaps more than the reality itself--we leave further confirmation of the dissonance between ideal and real for future study.

A pattern evident in almost every interview with these Greeks from St. Markela was one of men assuming superordinate positions over women, and women deferring, in public, to male decisions. Such a generalization is admittedly broad. Agitated confrontations between husbands and wives were not unseen nor infrequent. Normatively, however, and in public situations where we could observe behavior between a man and a woman, women tended to show deference. Husbands, for example, led their wives to a place in the church where the man wanted to sit. Husbands did not become irritated with their children, although such irritation was not unheard of, but husbands chastised their wives if the children were unruly. During interviews husbands conducted the interviews, decided when we would have coffee, and what we should discuss, for how long, and whether or not we should change the topic. If my appointment was deliberately made with the wife, she made certain her husband would be home shortly after I arrived. On occasions when I spoke with the wife about personal topics or about family decisions, she as often as not referred me to her husband. Factual accounts of genealogies or life histories were within her area of expertise--she could freely divulge non-incriminating facts. But opinions were controlled by her husband. On repeated occasions men even answered

the questions which I deliberately addressed to their wives. When it came time for the children to go to sleep, the women were instructed to see that it was done. The women never once suggested that the man tuck in the children and that she would continue our conversation (this was quite unlike many cases in the homes of Greeks attending St. Demitrios).

When one asked either the man or the woman in these interviews to rank their own positions and its importance relative to that of their spouse, invariably the male ranked his higher than that of the woman. Out of twenty-five interview cases, nineteen responded by ranking the male higher than the female. Interviewees, unfortunately, were not all of the same sex so it is difficult to judge whether all men or all women agree with this ranked scale. The rationale for placing the man above the woman was that his place in the world of work gave the family its place in the world. The woman's role as homemaker, protector of a man's children, and of his honor, was not considered unimportant--but private. It was personal and not of public importance, and consequently not important at all. As one informant commented at great length

> The woman has some power, subtle power. The man has the major power. The woman may think she has. Americans can't understand when you say that I have the power in this house. My wife will sit there, she'll tell you. On minor things I'll generally yield, but on anything major, the man has to have the power. It comes out of the fact that we have a lot of "maleness." We don't allow our women to put the saddle on us, so to say, because then you don't have the spirit you are supposed to have. You are supposed to go out into the world and be free to handle whatever you have to handle. How can you really be free with an open spirit if you know that the wife holds the power in the home. She, of course, let's face it, is there with the children. She has a lot to say, but once the father comes in she agrees to whatever he decides. She'll fight him, and even win one when he gets very old. She usually steps on him at that point. All women seem to like to do it. But when he is young, he is the power in that house. He brings home the money. He makes the decisions. He dictates what does on in that house.

His wife replied

> The woman usually accepts this role. You see, here it's not a matter of saying that I'm the boss. It's a whole psychology around how to capture and sort of keep the woman in her place. It's something which reflects the young man's feelings of the Greatness of Greece, and not too many other peoples have such greatness to identify with.

The subtleties of this woman's deference to her husband became most apparent every time I addressed a question to her. She would begin to answer it and he would finish her thought. Or, if he let her answer, he would then continue his own discussion as if she had simply not been there at all. (He didn't even let me comment on his or her points but insisted on telling the "whole truth" himself).

In another home where both the husband and wife were supposed to be home for the interviews I could not discuss anything with the wife, Sophia, while her husband, George, was present, I eventually had to come early to see her or make separate appointments with her in the afternoons. During evening discussions Sophia invariably spent most of her time tending to the children or preparing coffee and dessert. Her husband, George, completely dominated our conversation with philosophical discussions on the virtues of St. Markela, on the glories of Greece, on the demise of New York City, or on the proper place of women, including myself, namely in the home.

The young man, Nick, who had introduced me to this couple, was Sophia's cousin. During several of the interviews he sat patiently struggling to steer George into discussing those things which I had wanted to investigate. After one conversation Nick apologized for George's ability to dominate both our conversations and his wife.

> He always treats his wife that way, and he treats other women with the same arrogance. George doesn't think Sophia has a head on her shoulders, or that she might contradict him--and he couldn't

> stand to have his wife contradict him in public. He always makes out as if he is the boss in his own home. But you should see Sophia get back. We all know in the family that when she wants to get her way she can cry, yell, scream, and finally get George to do what she wants.

In our conversations during afternoon interviews, Sophia was most willing to stick directly to our questionnaire, answering everything she could without diverging from the central points to discuss other subjects related to them. She ended most probing with a firm, but final dismissal of my question: "My husband told you all about that before."

The willingness of these women to generally defer to the wishes of their husbands in public, or to permit their husbands to handle topics concerning things outside their home, their children and their families, suggests that the husband and wife have accepted different positions, to varying degrees, within their marital arrangement. The wife's position, particularly in public situations (e.g. when a strange interviewer is present, or in church), is subordinate to that of her husband.

Women are nevertheless, not adverse to complaining about their selfless devotion to the wishes of their husbands, and even to the demands of their children. Both husbands and wives agreed that their worlds were separate and that the wife was supposed to remain in the home. Yet, the repetitive cleaning and cooking and caring for the child characterizing the daily life of the wife was neither satisfying nor completely accepted by these women. Most of the women believed that work outside their homes was not acceptable for a woman--it posed a danger to her physical and sexual safety and jeopardized her proper fulfillment of her role as a housewife. One woman was always cleaning the same room every day at the same time that I arrived. She complained that if she went to work there would be no one to make sure that the house was

clean. Who would tend to the children when they returned from school? Who would prepare her husband's dinner?

> If my husband comes home and finds that I haven't cleaned this room he's going to think that I'm a poor wife or that I sleep all day. I know this room was cleaned yesterday, but it doesn't matter. I work very hard to keep this house neat and to get my husband's dinner ready when he comes home. There's nothing which makes him madder than having a TV dinner waiting for him. After he's worked all day his wife should have a good, hot dinner waiting for him. If I worked who would do it. Yet, sometimes I wish I could get away from this.

This repetitiveness seemed both onerous and important to these women. Yet, for several of the women who had recently emigrated from Greece, their lives here were considered easier and more pleasant than they had been in Greece. Homes were easier to keep neat and dinners took less time to prepare. Shopping was easier and life seemed much more pleasant for the woman than it had been at home. In fact, in one case where the husband was insistent on returning to Greece, the wife was very disturbed about going back to a life style which was physically more cumbersome for her--even if it was esthetically and culturally more comfortable for her husband.

The primary responsibility of the woman was the home and family. Much of life centered on the house itself, on trips to the market, and on visits to other family members, usually to those who lived within walking distance. Social life outside of these arenas was limited. Casual conversations with neighbors during the warmer months were usually confined to the front steps or the neutral areas between fences separating front yards from each other. The only "safe" public center for women was the church. Sundays and Saints Days at church were consequently important social events for these women--and most viewed them as such. The greetings between women before and after church and the lunches frequently served by the church provided opportunities for women to meet and socialize. Most said that they rarely brought

these acquaintances into their homes. It was the man, they said, who usually invited people into the home. Women met acquaintances at the store or in church, but it was rare that they exchanged invitations into each other's homes. Few even had friends.

The Greek men whose wives attended St. Markela or who might even attend church themselves, generally viewed the church, the home, and the market as arenas where men weren't needed, where they should not interfere, and where their wives could handle the "less important" decisions. The man's primary responsibility was to earn a living for his family. It was in the world of work that he was the dominant figure.

The men's social life was as male-dominated as his wife's was woman-oriented. His life revolved around work with other men, cards and drinks with other men and generally no church--with women. Male involvement in the church was considered by some of them to be a spiritual nonsense and a waste of their time. A few men felt that the church was important--but not of importance to them. Several, a half dozen in all, were emotionally and actively involved in the church and attended frequently with their wives and children. Some of those who were not frequent church goers did attend special holiday masses or communions with their children. Few objected to their wives' support of the church. As one informant, who rarely attended any church, said:

> The church does important things. It runs a day school for my children and a religious program to teach them Greek and the religion. I can't do that. The church has to. The Bishop is an exceptional man. His art works are sold all over the country to help support the church. How can I not help him out. I just don't want to get involved in the church. It's not my place. My wife goes every week with the children. That's enough for us.

The church is good, but not good for men. The religion itself is good, but not the concern of the males. The women, "they're supposed to be religious." said one informant. "The man has too many other concerns with his daily life."

When it comes to the fund-raising concerns of the church, however, or the leadership of the church community, the men had no objections to relying on the priests. The women, they said, don't know how to operate a church--the priests should do it, with the men in the community guiding them. "Women don't know how to handle money. They can do the charitable duties of the church. The important jobs should be left to the men." Some of the men attending the church had misgivings about the ability of the Bishop and priests to handle these economic matters. "These priests are very gracious, giving people. They are selfless and devoted to their religion. Can such spiritual people be good with money?"

There seems to be a division of the world into male and female domains with the male assuming control over public and financial concerns and the woman left with spiritual and familial ones. Further, maleness and male spheres were considered superior to those of the female. Females were to defer to the wishes of the male; female concerns were supposed to take secondary positions to those of the man.

In Greece, male children were considered more important to a family, particularly to a father's self image, than were female children. Daughters, in Greece, were traditionally financial burdens. This preference of males over females seemed to continue here in the United States in spite of the fact that few parents were concerned with dowering their daughters. Daughters were no longer the economic burdens they had traditionally been in Greece, yet they still remained in subordinate positions of importance. Several newly arrived

immigrants confessed that they had left Greece because they had several daughters and could not anticipate properly dowering them to suitable husbands over in Athens. In New York, they did not expect to have to pay a dowry, and in fact, the elder daughter was planning to marry in several months without a dowry.

Yet, while the financial and emotional burden of daughters had lifted, the inferior position of daughters remained intact. Males and male children were still considered preferable to females. In one instance, in fact, a lovely Greek woman who interpreted for me in church showed me a picture of her child--an adorable son, I thought, dressed in a sailor outfit with hair cropped as if it were a little boy. The child was going to be a brilliant doctor some day, she said. She and her husband were saving for the child's education. When I asked her how old her son was she replied, somewhat dismayed, that the boy was a girl (and that she was seven.)

Parents and their Children

Males and the concerns of men were considered more important than those of females, and husbands decisions were deferred to by their wives. But, in this social hierarchy, parents considered themselves more important than and their interests preeminent over those of their children. Greeks, in this segment of the community if not stereotypically as an ethnic group, faced a dilemma in raising their children. Most believed that children should follow the wishes of their parents both as small infants and children and later in decisions relating to marriage and careers. On the other hand, many Greeks also want their children to pursue careers and lives which were economically more productive than those of their parents and occupationally more prestigious than their parents. That is, they want their children to excel and to be socially mobile,

but they are not sure if it should be in America or in Greece. Those who attend St. Markela were also concerned with the future attachment of their children to their Greek heritage and Greek Orthodox religion. They wanted their children to continue to use the Greek language in their daily lives, to marry Greeks, preferably from Greece, and to live a life ritually and spiritually filled with Hellenic heritage. This specific declaration by these Greeks of their concern with Hellenism and Orthodoxy in many ways, took precedence over their upward mobility and the pursuit of better careers for their children. Control over the children, consequently, assumed major importance in the minds of these Greeks.

Several instances illustrate this hierarchical relationship between parents and their children. When I spoke with mothers who had their children in St. Markela's day nursery or had plans to send their children to this school, several verbalized the hope that by teaching their children proper "Greek" as well as proper Greek Orthodoxy they could closely supervise their children's development, and tightly knit them to their Greekness and to their homes. Several other mothers, on the other hand, believed that by doing the exact opposite of these mothers, namely, by keeping their children in their homes, they could similarly protect and control their children.

Several high school age boys, whose mothers attended the church, were not attending school; instead they were working. When one boy was asked why he worked instead of studying or getting remedial work after school, he replied that his parents were unhappy here and he was working to help the entire family return to Greece. His education was less important than his family's interests. In another case, the boy had left school altogether and was working full time as a dishwasher. He was getting sub-union, sub-minimum wages and working long hours. His parents were not at all interested in

having their son return to school, even if, long-term, his education might be financially beneficial to them. The mother was working, and the father had two unskilled labor jobs. They were pooling their money so they could return home. Familial concerns were again set above the individual future of the son.

When I asked the parents of these boys whether they had not put their own interests above those of their children and might be endangering the future of their children, the parents said "Yes, we are concerned about our son, but he must help his family out first, then he can pursue his own interests." This was very different from those Greeks who I knew who were saving every cent so their sons could attend college--sacrificing summer vacations, working at two jobs, even turning to godparents for assistance in some instances. The emphasis among these Greeks at St. Markela seemed much more on the parents' control of their children for the family, particularly for the future of the family, than it was on the parents' concern with the child's personal interests, even if those might benefit the family in later years.

Marriage was another area in which parents felt they should still control the decisions of their children. Arranged marriages were often difficult when immigrants did not know too many non-kinsmen. One recent immigrant said that her parents had simply gone about making inquiries through the church and through the men with whom her father played cards until they found her a suitable spouse. She didn't even know about it until it was announced at a party her parents held for her family. She didn't discuss it or even feel she should discuss it. When she looks back on her parents' choice it was not a bad one, but she knows now that next time, if there should ever be one, she'll try to have a bigger say about the choice. When asked if she thought she could similarly control the decision of her children she was ambivalent. She thought that it

was the parents'responsibility to see that their children had a good marriage, but she was uncertain how much she would try to arrange a marriage or simply try to influence her child's decision on who to marry.

In one case where the man had come over to the United States by himself, no arranged marriage could take place. Yet, he was most adamant about the fact that he was going to carefully pick a man for his young daughter--and he was also going to make certain that she did not run around with all the other teenagers in the area. He was going to control her as best he could. But he was also aware that it was going to be difficult to hold on to his authority when all the other families around him were having difficulties with their children and all the children in school were educating each other on how far they could break the hold their parents had on them.

Kinsmen and Friends

The hierarchical arrangement in relations within the Greek families described above has parallels in the values placed by these Greeks on the relative importance of kinship associations over other kinds of relations, e.g., friendship or work relations. It is difficult to determine if the world here is viewed as a series of concentric circles with those closer to the nuclear family also safer and socially more intimate to the nuclear family, or whether the world is conceived as a series of hierarchies: males over females, husbands over wives, parents over children, and kinsmen over friends. Informants themselves were less than completely in agreement on the shape of this structure.

Kinsmen were considered more important and more powerful influences on the lives of these Greeks. Kinsmen were visited more frequently than non-kinsmen, consulted more often than non-kinsmen, and frequently were sources of economic assistance when such aid was needed. Agnatic kinsmen were not

necessarily more important than those related to the women. Males might be more influential than their wives. But social life seems to focus on the woman's family. Practical considerations and personal preferences, instead played important roles in determining which kinsmen would be brought into a social relationship and which would be considered as a potential business partner.

The primary importance assigned to kinsmen over non-kinsmen was clearly apparent in both surveys and interviews conducted with these Greeks. It was most apparent in whom I met when conducting these interviews. In not one of the interviews conducted with these Greeks did any of them invite over a friend or suggest a friend with whom I might be able to set up another interview. In only one case did the woman give me the name of a non-kinsmen upon whom I could call for another interview. The men were in all instances completely disturbed by my inquiry and reluctant to call a friend, invite him over or set up an interview for me. Several of the men candidly said that they did not know any friends well enough to ask them in to meet with us. Others felt that they could not trust their friends. One woman said she did not know any women to invite in for an afternoon discussion or for an evening's interview. Kinsmen were visited almost exclusively on Sundays and Saturday evenings. Casual visits in many of the homes were inevitably from parents or cousins of the woman being interviewed.

When asked about preferences between cognatic and agnatic kinsmen both spouses generally agreed that the wife usually visited with her own family, particularly her parents on a frequently informal basis, while visits with her husband's family were usually on ritual occasions.

Outsiders and Insiders

When asked to discuss their relationships with people associated with the outside world--e.g. politicians, doctors, lawyers, public administrators, social welfare offices, etc.--most of these Greeks concluded that they had little use for these men. In most instances where the assistance of one or the other position was needed, personal links to a politician or a lawyer were called upon to serve some personal need. Men limited their involvement in local political club activities to the card playing in the club house. Ties with the local political party seemed non-existent. Even the concept of individual affiliation with an abstract or an actual political party seemed unethical to these people. If some special help was needed to keep an illegal relative here or to expedite citizenship papers the local politician was approached, but preferably through a kinsman who knew him personally.

Contact with doctors was avoided, if possible. Hospitals were also avoided. Both were associated with things which could be dangerous to the individual. Lawyers were similarly considered with suspicion. Kinship connections again provided important personal patron links to lawyers when their assistance might be needed.

City agencies or even those affiliated with the larger church Archdiocese structure were viewed with great suspicion. Most Greeks believed that they could take care of themselves without city agencies.

Each of these instances suggests that these Greeks considered themselves linked to the larger world through connections cemented by bonds of blood--kinship if not ethnic bonds. Connections with strangers were dangerous, and probably, as one informant said, unproductive. Relations with those individuals associated with the larger society were considered asymmetrical ones.

The outer world was considered more powerful. Hence, intermediaries able to bridge the gap between these outer and inner worlds provided essential links between the two asymmetrical sides in the hierarchy.

Bosses and Workers

While no direct observations were made of these men at the place of work, all of them were asked to comment on their relations with their bosses and with the other workers. In no case was the informant in a managerial position. All were either under the direction of a manager or self-employed but without employees under them. The self-employed men were either mechanics or plumbers or operated cabs or frankfurter stands. Most of those employed were in the restaurant business as waiters, bus boys, dishwashers. In several cases, they worked in some aspect of the garment or fur industry. As a result, most viewed themselves as under the control of either a boss or at the mercy of their customers. Since there were few self-employed men, most of my discussions centered on the problems encountered by these Greeks working for other men, often for non-Greeks. The general image one received was that these men felt that they were constantly being supervised, controlled, moved and ordered around. Not that these feelings were expressed in negative tones or with great objection. Many of the men felt quite happy in their positions, as long as the pay was good, and were quite willing to take the offensive nicknames or abusive language of their bosses, or to work excessive overtime or come in at objectionable hours as long as they made money. Yet, when asked to rank themselves in this relationship with their bosses most of the men felt that they occupied inferior positions or were in subordinate, deferential positions -- perhaps much as their wives were to their husbands in their homes. In almost no instance did these men feel comfortable, secure or powerful in their jobs. They were proud that they performed them well -- but insecure in their subordinate position.

Conclusion

We leave St. Markela with the feeling that this community is without the turmoil, the agony, the quest for comfort and identity which seemed to pervade every act, every scene, every moment at St. Demitrios. The church community at St. Markela appears - to outside observers and church participants alike - to share common definitions of the proper and the good in life. Economically, these Greeks are less widely stratified than those attending St. Demitrios. The span between rich and poor, or between degrees of middle-class are absent. The common denominator is based on a shared sense of being dominated by an abstract larger society--by their bosses, by their lot as working people. Yet, while many members of St. Demitrios are also working-class in occupation, members of St. Markela do not, as a whole, seem to be seeking material sources of upward mobility or "modernized" institutions through which to articulate a desire for recognition. Politically impotent, outcast in their own eyes from the more "established" St. Demitrios community, the Greeks attending St. Markela, or supporting the church through their wives, seek recognition of their spiritualism, their ethnic purity and power, through the claims of sanctity, spiritual perfectability, and religious authenticity of the charismatic Bishop and his assistants.

Certainly, the fact that so few men participate in the church is intriguing. Most husbands of the active church-going women are not regular participants in church ceremony. Yet, when questioned, they express a sense of affiliation and affection for the Bishop, his church and his selflessness. The men who do participate regularly in the church, and their numbers were slowly growing, viewed the church as an untapped arena in which to seek public recognition of their own import in a community. These were the men who spoke so

frequently of the evils of St. Demitrios and its priest.

For the women attending St. Markela, the church and its leaders offer a spiritual and social setting which appear consistent with the woman's role as the center of the home and the family. The spatial intensity and "hot" body contact generated by the small, enclosed church sanctuary seemed to say that this was a church which, like the woman's home, was safe, warm, possibly controllable. Certainly it was not as overwhelming, unemotional, and rigidified as the spacious SS. Catherine and George.

The actions of the Bishop and the priests, as well as the nuns were, in overt and subtle forms, different from their counterparts at St. Demitrios. The traditional style of dress, the concern with hair and beards, the monastic life style were hardly comparable to the modern, materialistic orientation, manly attire and pragmatic strategies of Father Poulos. If the latter appeared masculine, the former seemed clearly maternal.

The question which now needs clarification is why some Greeks view St. Markela as a pure, comfortable church, with its leaders as models of appropriate behavior and values for Greeks and Greek religious leaders, while other Greeks reject that model of Greekness and endorse the more masculine, materialistic, cold and calculating images portrayed by St. Demitrios and its religious leadership, as represented by Father Poulos? Is it a question of assimilationist Greeks contrasted with incapsulationist Greeks seeking different arenas in which to pursue their goals of entering America or rejecting America? Or, is there some ordering element in the life styles of these different kinds of Greeks which results in the articulation of a system of symbolic forms communicating a world

order consistent with the socio-economic and political positions of the distinctive segments of the Greek Community?

Chapter V

Analysis

This study has documented the transitions experienced by Greek immigrants and Greek immigrant communities in Astoria and in the United States since the early 1900's. The history of Greek institution-building in general and the particular development of St. Demitrios and St. Markela in Astoria suggest that Greeks, regardless of time or place, have repeatedly divided over how to best contend with transformations in their local communities and in the larger economic, social, political and cultural milieu of American life. Regardless, it seems, of time or place, some segments of Greek communities have struggled to culturally enter mainstream America. At times this cultural entrance included a social integration with members of other ethnic communities and a gradual blurring of structural boundaries between Greek and other ethnic groupings. For other Greeks, acculturation did not necessitate structural or social integration. Among still other segments of Greek communities, the very idea of cultural transformation or of social integration was repugnant. Such Greeks and the institutional arenas in which they sought encouragement, struggled to remain socially incapsulated, culturally divorced from American life styles, and sustaining conceptualizations of the world which appear to reflect visions transported intact from traditional village Greece.

In this analysis we offer two hypotheses which attempt to explain which Greeks pursued which paths: assimilation, acculturation or incapsulation, and why. In the first argument we pursue a traditional analytic path. We attempt to link the Greek's choice of strategy for adapting to America with his socio-economic class and his efforts to achieve a particular style of life

consistent with that class position. The selection of particular sets of symbols are seen as articulators of altered positions in the class hierarchy. Institutional transformations are similarly analyzed in terms of how they offer public expression of strategic choices preferred by members and leaders of these institutions.

The second argument diverges from traditional approaches to the study of immigrant adaptation to American society. Our study has focused on an array of public, systematically organized, sets of symbols which seem to communicate a sense of propriety and comfort to those Greeks who attend one or the other Greek Orthodox Church. We might feel comfortable ourselves with an argument which links these symbolic systems to the personal and collective strategies of these two kinds of Greeks, as they each attempt to adapt to life in Astoria, in New York City and in America. Yet, we must still wonder about the multidimensionality of symbols. Precisely what kinds of messages are these symbolic systems communicating? The second hypothesis develops the argument that these two symbolic sets articulate different perceptions of the social orders operating in the daily lives of these different segments of the Greek community. That these symbols might indeed still express adaptive strategies for immigrants and Greek-Americans struggling to succeed in America is not disputed. But we might be overlooking the fact that these symbols are consistent with, give rational justification to and spiritual confirmation of the legitimacy of the social orders in which these different types of Greeks are operating. In our conclusion we consider further the difficulties of deciphering the many levels of meaning communicated through behavioral, gestural, spatial, and ideological symbols. And, at that time we raise the prospects of how we might test these two hypotheses to lend further clarification to their relative explanatory value.

Argument 1

The formation of different institutions to cater to the social, political, economic and spiritual needs of Greeks followed a pattern of division and feuding, with Greek communities split along traditional-progressive, lower class-middle class lines. Middle class Greeks, or at least those Greeks pursuing upwardly mobile, middle class occupational strategies for themselves or their children, tended to support American-oriented, democratic, egalitarian, types of organizations which rejected traditional criteria for status and power and which emphasized newly acquired monetary interests as the basis for group membership and influence. AHEPA, for example, was formed by businessmen; GAPA was the result of a backlash among working class Greeks. The formation of anti-canonical churches by rebellious bishops was typically supported by royalist factions of "urban peasants," often the more newly arrived Greek immigrants. Members of the middle class business communities and the professions tended to identify with canonical churches and the anti-royalist politics of Venizelos in Greece. If we look more carefully at the symbolic transformations which took place in the Greek Orthodox churches in Astoria, some of the class-related impact of these institutions are highlighted and the relationship between class position and strategies for adaptation become clarified.

The history of the Greek Orthodox church in America before the Second World War was characterized by repeated internal fragmentation based partially on an inability on the part of the Archdiocese to comprehend transformations occurring within local laity and clergy. Only after the war did the Archbishop begin to recognize that parishioners were demanding modifications in church policies, programs and the structure of buildings. These changes were in both the spiritual and secular symbols which were used by church members to

articulate other aspects of their lives to members of their own church communities and to members of other religious communities. It soon became apparent to the clerical hierarchy that such changes were essential to insure the future support of Greeks and Greek-Americans for the Greek Orthodox Church.

Demands for changes usually emanated from middle class sectors of Greek communities. Middle class, often but not always American-born Greeks, were pressuring religious leaders for modifications which would reduce the Old World distinctiveness of Orthodox churches. Church rituals had to be modernized; priestly functions and appearances had to change to eliminate the distance between clergy and laity; parishioner control of church affairs had to increase. The inclusion-exclusion process seems to reflect an accomodation on the part of parishioners to Protestant images of proper churches and propriety in church behavior. These accomodations parallelled those taking place in the private lives and public exposure of parishioners who were discarding those ethnically distinctive, potentially offensive trademarks of their Hellenic heritage. In local churches, they began to initiate changes which would create facsimiles of Protestant churches.

While Orthodoxy holds many tenets in common with Protestant theology, American Protestantism differs from Greek Orthodoxy in several specific ways which become evident in changes undergone in St. Demitrios. First, if we consider the male-orientation of the Protestant church and the traditional female domination of the village Orthodox church, a transition is apparent in St. Demitrios. Men in Protestantism actively participate in church rituals, in the proselytizing of the religion, and in the fiscal operations of the church. The men who attend St. Demitrios are exerting increased domination over both ritual and fiscal matters, while they are also participating in the spiritual

ceremonies of the religion. Ministers in Protestant churches, moreover, are considered equals to, not superiors of other parishioners. They do not wear distinctive costumes to publicly distinguish themselves as priests or as particular kinds of priests. Worship is individual in orientation. The church is egalitarian and democratic. Men and women, ministers and parishioners intellectually communicate with supernatural beings.

Traditionally, the Greek Orthodox Church was hierarchically arranged in its spiritual and structural form. Priests were symbolically differentiated from parishioners. Women were separated from men. Man was separated from God. Men avoided the church because it was viewed as a center of female power. Priests were similarly avoided. They held ambiguous positions as males in female dress, as necessary for life yet potentially dangerous for male honor.

The overt transformations in the style of dress and definition of roles by Father Poulos at St. Demitrios articulates a shift from the sexual ambivalence of the traditional priest to the clear male conceptualization of the Protestant minister. The absence of the beard and the long hair, the concerns with operating the church as a successful business, the subtle role played by the priest in background decision-making, all seem to suggest a Protestantization in parishioner and priestly definitions of proper behavior. The increased participation of lay leaders and of women in the political and fiscal decisions of the church similarly attest to a democratization of relations--an equalizing of roles and responsibilities.

The subject of proper orderliness in church ceremonies repeatedly emerged in discussions with Greeks attending St. Demitrios. Protestant churches use pews to organize parishioners into clearly defined rows, with proper distances separating parishioners from each other and from the minister. Emotional

outbursts, excessive genuflection, overt prostrations are considered inappropriate if not outright disrespectful in Protestant churches. Traditionally, however, such emotional responses and a fluid flow of worshippers characterized Greek Orthodox ceremonies. Churches never had pews, or chairs. Parishioners stood, moved about, crossed themselves and kissed the icons. Emotional displays were acceptable. As the Orthodox Observer wrote in 1973, "this behavior was too disruptive, superstitious, uncouth and vulgar" in the eyes of the larger society. The Protestant world wanted orderly rows of parishioners worshipping in rigid union demonstrating their intellectual, not their emotional abilities to communicate with God. The introduction of pews, the concern with space, the selection of cool, orderly colors, the construction of a new church building with clean, modern lines, all seem to attest to the deliberate efforts by members of St. Demitrios to transform their church into one more fitting for middle-class parishioners in Protestant America.

The growing national concerns of Greek Orthodox leaders for expanding membership and increasing operating funds, as well as demonstrating their equality as a major American religion equally support the argument that these changes have deliberately attempted to link the Greek Orthodox Church, and its aspiring members to the larger society. Secular programs ranging in scope from Boy and Girl Scout to athletic clubs, nursery schools and senior citizen centers, are similar efforts by the church to sustain supporter interests and confirm the church's active role as caretakers for their communities. Such a role is well reinforced by Protestant concepts of charity and public action. These programs express to non-Greeks, as well as demanding Greeks, that the organization is doing that which is proper and necessary as an American religious organization.

Associated with the Protestant demand for sobriety and self-control and for egalitarianism was a Protestant image of masculine virtues. The American image of the male not only allocated the religious-political sphere to his control, but, consistent with the symbols of this sphere, dressed him in conservative suits, emphasized his ability to control his sexuality and aggression, and forced him to suppress his emotions, his exuberance, and his humanness. He was attached to family, God and country. He pursued his virtuous goals of economic success with hard work, individual initiative, self-denial and thrift. America's heroes were the frontiersmen, the explorer, and the self-made man. All others had to live up to these heroes or be forever alien to America (Schrag, 1970).

These WASP-defined criteria for a proper American church and for proper behavior for Americans, within and outside of these churches, were beginning to find cultural articulation and integrity as an American identity about the time when Greeks were first beginning to forge into American society. To a degree, the presence of these dark, swarthy, exuberant, "sexy" foreigners (as fair-skinned, blue-eyed, tightly controlled WASPs conceptualized the south European immigrant) might have created the need for a formal declaration by the WASP establishment of what it meant to be "American." If the host society wanted these immigrants to become more like them, they had to clarify what "like them" was all about. Once formalized, this American idealization became a model into which Greeks, and others, were supposed to remodel themselves. In the process, the immigrant was to similarly reconstruct his institutions or adopt new ones to better fit the American image of a proper social structure.

For the upwardly mobile Greek, struggling to enter middle-class

positions, the adoption of this code of conduct for male behavior and code of construction and performance for religious institutions, was a preexisting condition or at least a coexisting condition for entrance into the political-economic structure of the larger society, as well as for social acceptance by that society. The upwardly mobile Greek's entrance into and continued success within this system might have depended on his ability to visually pass into that system unnoticed. He might have had to seek status as a "blood brother," a fictive kinsmen with WASP-dominated America. Strategically, he could not continue to be viewed as an alien, or to have his organizations appear to foster distinctiveness. He had to communicate the message that he agreed that a WASP way of life was superior to his past way of life, and that he was willing to discard the old and adopt the new. He had to publicly demonstrate that he understood public norms and shared rules for evaluating behavior, as well as the sanctions for those who transgressed that behavioral norm.

For Greeks in Astoria, from the earliest years to the present, the situation might have been one of middle-class Greeks, or upwardly mobile Greeks seeking outlets to identify with the larger society. Most of the members of St. Demitrios view themselves as members of the middle-class or on their way into it. The American-born children of these Greek immigrants often hold occupations which establish clearly their parents' claims to middle-class positions. In most cases, these Greeks have entered these positions through economic and/or political connections to non-Greeks. They have few encompassing linkages binding them to the Greek enclave or to distinctive Greek customs. As many Greeks commented, in the past, the Greek enclave was too small to support extensive economic enterprise. While the community might catapult individuals into the larger economic system, it could hardly support its members

by itself. Those Greeks who sought to politically unify the community struggled against a fierce antipathy to politicians and a strongly protected individualism.

Further, most potential political leaders discovered that their futures lay with links to non-Greeks--to Italians or Jews or Irish. Greeks offered each other little and claimed little in return. The changes described for St. Demitrios seemed to permit these Greeks to meet, pray, socialize, establish instrumental networks or emotionally supportive networks, and remain with those Greeks who shared, like they did, a common desire to participate in the larger economic system as individuals. They did not have to discard their ethno-religious identities, as such. The rules of the American game of assimilation did not reject ethnic identities. They only suppressed those cultural and behavioral forms which Americans did not view as valuable, proper or good patterns of conduct. It only demanded changes which publicly facilitated participation of individuals from diverse backgrounds in common organizational frameworks. So Greeks and Italians and Wasps could work side by side or one above the other without friction.

What about those Greeks who did not aspire to middle-class stations in life, or who aspired but failed? Not all Greeks were able to achieve economic success to the degree to which they desired it in America. Not all Greeks were able or willing to alter their public or private lives to conform to WASP demands for an American style of life. Those who failed or did not aspire at all perhaps also sought solace, support, security or the benefits possibly still offered by their Hellenic ancestry. These Greeks might have retreated to their Greek worlds. Or they may have discovered that for their goals the Greek enclave and distinctive Greek customs offered a potentially profitable and/or powerful avenue to pursue their particular needs. This may have been as much a positive

strategy as a negative falling from grace. Some of these Greeks might have sought these advantages through those organizations which remained attached to Greece and to Hellenism. The GAPA was one such organization. Rebel churches might have been another. In both instances, these organizations had publicly declared war on those Greeks who sought to modify themselves and their institutions, defile their Hellenic traditions, and succumb to assimilationist pressures. These organizations offered incapsulationist Greeks alternative approaches for dealing with nativist pressures--approaches which asserted the purity and elitism of their life style and culture and denigrated those who sought to change it.

These systems were ones in which some Greeks might have been better able to compete. Status and prestige rested on cues and codes which the immigrant already knew and controlled. They knew the rules of the game, and they could still coerce others into following them. They had power over themselves and others. For these Greeks the changes in the "established" churches or the AHEPA-like organizations were strange, unfamiliar and out of their control. The things which mattered in these changing churches--material success, occupational prestige and mobility, new egalitarian life styles--were beyond the reach of many of these other Greeks or abhorrent to their sense of propriety and morality.

For these incapsulated Greeks, rebel churches permitted them to perpetuate their traditional life styles and supported their previous senses of orderliness. The church was still a woman's domain. Males continued to seek others in arenas which were familiar and comfortable to them. Coffee shops and park benches remained proper places to play cards and drink coffee with other men. They could argue and debate the affairs of the world within the confines of

a setting which accepted their ways and shared their values, and viewed their world in the same segregated, hierarchically arranged way.

During periods of economic expansion in the United States, assimilationist oriented Greeks and their organizations seemed to expand in numbers and size (Salutos, 1964). The early 1970's, however, brought about some dramatic changes in this pattern of growing Protestanization in Greek communities, particularly among the major concentrations of Greeks in New York City and probably in other urban centers where large numbers of Greek immigrants settled. These changes seem to be helping the growth of small, schismatic rebel churches.

We discussed earlier the differences between early and more recent groups of Greek immigrants. One contrast between them stands as an important factor in the participation of Greeks in the different churches in Astoria. The majority of early immigrants were unskilled peasants. Most were on the bottom of their social hierarchies in Greece. Most were politically impotent. While their dreams were inflated when they came to America, they still held dreams which were within the reality of the opportunities which awaited them here. Most were willing to manipulate their energies and determination in the image of the American ideal of the self-made man--the Protestant ethic of hard work and thrift, individualism and self-reliance. Perhaps centuries of domination by the Turks had left them able to confront hard work. In a sense, these were "Americans" without knowing it. Their ethos fitted the Protestant ethic before it had to be transformed.

The newly arriving Greeks from Greece today have different backgrounds, skills and previous experiences with urban, industrial society. They are familiar with the life of a migrant worker and have few delusions about

the fact that they are primarily that--not immigrants but migrants searching for work. Air travel has facilitated their mobility. Many are trained by their past experiences in the temporary nature of industrial work. Yet, their expectations of America are great--partly inflated by the mass media and partly accentuated by the experiences and accomplishments of their relatives and fellow Greeks in America. While their predecessors had little option but to stay in America and weather the rise and fall of economic opportunities here, these Greeks expect more for less, and don't have to commit themselves to a prolonged stay here.

As we noted, when the U.S. immigration laws were changed in the mid-1960's, America's industry was in need of immigrant labor. Unemployment was as low as 3% in some sections of the country. Despite declining manufacturing jobs even New York was searching for skilled labor. The new Greek immigrants came to New York and other cities with these opportunities awaiting them. Yet, by the time most Greeks were able to participate in these job markets the nation's economic picture was turning bleak. Inflation was rising rapidly; unemployment was climbing; industries were closing plants and laying off workers. For many Greeks who were restricted by their language handicaps and rejected by their unfulfilled dreams, these depressed economic conditions aggravated their disenchantment with America. Most ironically, expanding economic conditions in Greece and the acute labor shortage caused by extensive emigration began to make the immigrant's decision to leave their homelands appear to be major errors (Time, 1973).

Some Greeks actually did return home. Others could not. Some were political expatriates and could not return to Greece for as long as the military junta remained in power. Others had daughters who they could not afford to

properly dower in Greece. Still others had families in the United States and, despite their own economic difficulties, many would rather stay with kinsmen than return home.

With political hierarchies in older churches, such as St. Demitrios, controlled by older members of the Greek community, and the new immigrant politically impotent, economically disadvantaged, socially outcast and emotionally uncomfortable in these "progressive" churches, rebel churches such as St. Markela offered comforting sanctuaries with power vacuums and open social structures for the new Greek.

Why, we must ask, are Greek immigrant men now appearing in slowly growing numbers in a church like St. Markela which is cloaked in symbols traditionally associated with women? I suspect that the answer might lay in the redefinition which has occurred in the United States over the past decade in the meanings of the symbols, costumes and behaviors of the priests and parishioners at both churches. Within the larger American society those things which were once considered dangerously weak, impure, emotion-laden and feminine (such as the long beard and hair and the long skirts of the Bishop and priests and the collective incapsulationist approach which they advocate at St. Markela) are now more acceptable within the realm of proper American dress and behavior. The blurring of sexually segregated lines by the youth counter culture during the late 1960's, and the efforts of feminists to cross or destroy sex-based domains, as well as the efforts of fashion industries to stylize male fashions and hair combs have combined to increase public tolerance of those forms which once represented deviations from aggressive, insensitive, emotionless men.

The fact that the priests at St. Demitrios still more closely fit this Protestant mold may no longer be advantageous to them. To be different,

ethnically distinctive, is no longer unclean, impure or tabooed in American society. To the contrary, the results of the Black Power and the "Black is Beautiful" campaigns and the subsequent ethnic movements of the Red Power and Young Lords and Mexican-American groups, white ethnics, particularly among the working classes began to reassert their ethnic identities using distinctive cultural forms to attract support for their collective economic and political concerns. Their distinctive group affiliations served as informal interest coalitions through which they could gain access to public resources, to their own tax monies, which were being distributed to other minority groups. The literature on this movement is growing rapidly (Greeley, 1970, 1975; Novak, 1973). (Greeks, in fact, were declared,during my own research as "ethnic minority" by the Federal government which enabled them to apply for poverty and other federal funds. This was a dubious honor, if not an insult, for most Greeks.)

The third change effecting Greek participation in these two churches is the current demise of the older versions of WASP models of the best strategies for dealing with the practical problems of American society. The earlier, highly individualistic, materialistic, Protestant ethic approach, as it was envisioned by the priests at St. Demitrios, has been replaced by a more cooperative, selfless spiritual approach such as that of the Bishop and priests at St. Markela. There has also been a shift in attitudes away from the traditional rigidity, coldness, and lack of emotional expression which dominated Protestant churches and Protestantized Greek Orthodox Churches towards those religious experiences which are more mystical, emotional and personal (Orthodox Observer, 1973; Braden, 1968).

In a sense, the newcomers are following the same paths as their predecessors into the larger society. They are selectively manipulating symbols

of their ethnic identities, only in the present context of their position in the larger society. These symbols may in fact, provide them with an avenue into that system -- a system which now struggles to accept those who are different as equals.

These changing conditions are posing a source of endless controversy within the Astoria community. As many of these new immigrants achieve measures of economic success and decide to stay in the United States, as they finally can afford to send their children to the private Greek day school and to pay for membership in the Orthodox Church affiliated with the Archdiocese, some begin to switch their religious affiliation to St. Demitrios. St. Demitrios still commands considerable prestige in both the older Greek community and in the larger, multi-ethnic community. Those new immigrants who seek acceptance among the Greeks at St. Demitrios find their distinctive brand of Greekness and of Orthodoxy a constant source of tension between themselves and the older members of the parish, and particularly with the American born Greeks who remain active in the church. For many of these older Greeks and Greek-Americans, ethnic distinctiveness has never been a socially desirable trademark. Despite changes in the larger society, "village Greek" remains for them a source of embarrassment. As a result, many of these Greeks are now considering moves to suburban communities. Their potential flight is leaving the priests at St. Demitrios with the prospects of a declining church membership in spite of the expanding new immigrant population. What these religious leaders must determine is how to redefine their manners and mores, the symbols and functions of their church, and their public images to attract and sustain the support of these new Greeks.

Argument 2

In the first argument developed above we highlighted the role of ethnic symbols in the adaptation of immigrants and members of ethnic groups to the demands and opportunities presented by their own and their host society. Emphasized in the process was the assumption that culture permits man to adapt to new environments and to changing environments and that symbols provide the tools for ordering models of society and providing models for dealing with that society and changes occurring within it. Or, to use a linguistic analogy, symbols are the phonemes or meaningful units of a culture and the culture is a grammar or set of rules for combining these units in ways which not only make conceptual sense but which facilitate social intercourse. They are the form which make social relations possible.

In this section we consider what these two symbolic systems are models of and guidelines for. If symbols assume meaning within a context, which context is influencing the meanings of these symbolic expressions of distinctive ethnic identities? Are the opportunities and demands for cultural conformity impinging on Greeks from the larger society? Or, are these distinctive symbolic systems expressions of divergent positions within a class hierarchy -- positions which produce distinctive views of the world and demand distinctive symbolic reinforcement that particular world views are rational representations of different realities. At this juncture we must ask what impact class considerations might have upon symbolic articulations of ethnic identity.

Duncan (1968) offers us two propositions with which we can begin our second hypothesis. The first suggests that:

> Social order is expressed through hierarchies which differentiate men into ranks, classes and status groups, and at the same time resolve differentiation through appeals to principles of order which transcend those upon which differentiation is based (1968).

The second suggests that:

> Hierarchy is expressed through the symbolization of superiority, inferiority and equality and of passage from one to the other (1968).

Further, to understand the meshing of relationships between society and symbolic expressions of its order and prescriptions of future courses of action, explanations must be "grounded in the analysis of social drama as a drama of hierarchy."

My purpose in beginning my discussion at this point is that each setting in which we observed relationships between members of each religious community--the family, kinship and friendship meetings, public cafes and movie houses, church rites and church social and educational functions, meetings on the street or in shops--offered us a short drama in which the nature of hierarchical relations (superior, inferior, or equal) were manifested. Consistencies appeared between these various situational dramas which suggested that members of each religious community shared common definitions of their own social order and of their positions within that order. Further, what seemed important communicators of information about these relative status positions in these hierarchies of social relations were the costumes, manners, language and style of speech and expression, adornments, and all the "formal arts" used to create individuals into actors in these microperformances, as well as the designs used to create stages for the dramas (e.g., the interior order of the church, the

manipulation of space, the colors selected for background designs (Duncan, 1968; Hall, 1973). It was for this reason that these particular aspects of the two churches and their respective memberships became the descriptive focus of the study. In these symbollic forms emerged expressions of social order, particularly the hierarchy of social relations.

Differences between communities in the organization of familial roles and the relative importance, prestige, and power assigned to each role are apparent. If we consider Greeks who attend St. Markela first, certain patterns emerge. Greeks from St. Markela seem to center their lives around their nuclear families and those members of the extended family who are available, supportive, and/or personally pleasing to members of the nuclear family. While links are certainly bilateral, emotional links between women and their parents often dominate social relations outside nuclear family ties. Individual preferences and the availability of kinsmen from either line, however, often take precedence over any other principle for selecting associates. Yet, kinsmen are clearly preferred members of the social universe and are ranked far above non-kin in importance to the family for instrumental and emotional support.

If family and kin are ranked above non-kin, Greeks are similarly considered superior, as people and associates, to non-Greeks. Marriages should preferably be with other Greeks. Work associates should be other Greeks. Informal relations, e.g., at tavernas or cafes or in church, should normatively be, and in fact usually are, with other Greeks. Further, within this category of other Greeks is an even more highly valued category of "Greeks like themselves:" namely, those Greeks who uphold traditional life styles and who live within the Greek enclave and who preferably attend the same church, St. Markela.

Within the household, roles and responsibilities are also ordered in

a superior-inferior hierarchy. Criteria for relative position in this context are sex and age. Males and those responsibilities and segments of the world assigned to males are deemed more important, superior, to familial survival, order and status than those ascribed to females and children. That is not to suggest that female contributions to this order, status and support are incidental or that females are impotent in decision-making functions of the family. This simply argues that the arrangement of roles and status places women into a ranking system where that which is male dominated is considered above that which is female dominated, and both are above that "controlled" by children. Even in the world of children, however, sisters are to defer to the control and interests of brothers, and sons are more desirable than daughters.

The one stage on which this relationships between males and females is reversed is the church. Females dominate the church. Even though they are dominated within it by males, these are males who wear the long skirts of women and who are viewed by other males as not only celibates (i.e., sexually neutered) but also sexually ambiguous in their status within the community. The Bishop and monks stand as a bridge between the superior male dominated public world and the inferior female dominated private world--and communicate, we later suggest, this ambivalent status in their costumes and manners.

Apart from the public world within the acceptable domain of "Greeks"--the church, the local taverna and cafenions, the markets and front stoops--is the larger world of work and politics. In both work and politics the world is similarly ordered into a dominant-subordinate hierarchy. But, in both instances, these Greeks occupy not the dominant position but the inferior one. It is perhaps this distinction which is most crucial in our later efforts to reconcile relations between the two communities of Greeks and the symbols each selects

to segregate itself from the other and relate to the larger society. As we discussed in Chapter IV, the common link tying the Greeks at St. Markela together in their occupational world was not that they all occupied "working-class" jobs but rather that all felt that their opportunities to control their future in these jobs was out of their hands and in those of their bosses. Some of these Greeks had previously held what we might categorize, and that they termed "middle class" occupations. Some were lower or middle level managers or they felt they earned incomes and shared aspirations with members of the lower middle class when they were in Western Europe or in Greece. Their present feelings of loss of status in their current occupations and with their present incomes stemmed as much from the absolute value of those jobs and salaries as from their feeling of having their incomes and futures decided by forces beyond their control. They were powerless, and hence inferior to those with control over them.

In politics their positions, they felt, were much the same. In many instances they were not citizens, and hence did not have (even if they wanted to use) access to established political machinery for gaining control over their "needs." On the other hand, most felt that the machinery itself was controlled by non-Greeks or by Greek defectors to the non-Greek world, and hence was unresponsive if not exploitive of them and their interests.

There are three areas in which we can observe symbolic expressions by these Greeks of their particular view of a proper pattern of behavior, a proper order to the universe. The first is in the meaning assigned to the church building itself--to its interior and exterior designs, to the organization of rows and of people within it during ceremonies, to the functional roles assigned particular parts of the church building. The second is the meaning assigned

to the dress, hair styles, adornments and behavior, as well as assumed goals of the Bishop and priests. And the third is the meaning assigned to the behavior of parishioners and the role they play in the operation of the church itself.

The use of space, the design of rooms, the placement and use of furnishings, were more than simply expressions of individual taste but also communicators of one's view of how things should be ordered, including how the social world, the inner world, the cosmic world, perhaps even the organized world is ordered. If we look at those aspects of St. Markela which church participants positively admired four elements stand out. The first is that the church is the proper size. By proper size informants said that the other churches were too big, too massive, too empty, to tall, too cold. St. Markela was small enough so they felt comfortably close to it when they were inside. Or, we might suggest, that they felt in control when they were within it.

Secondly, St. Markela was an old building. In its age, said my informants, it had purity and wisdom, traditions and legitimacy.

Thirdly, there was neither a fixed arrangement of chairs or pews within the church nor a separation of the church into rooms which served special purposes--such as classrooms or social centers. All functions were performed within the central hall which also served as the ritual center. All parishioners could freely roam, mingle, and move about during church rituals. They could push close to the altar and the Bishop, as well as to each other. The separation between the spiritual and the human was minimized; the isolation between individuals was eliminated; the division between secular and sacred was blurred.

The fourth element is the selection of colors and the use of lights and candles within the church. While church walls were painted institutional green, the use of deep reds and elaborate iconography, as well as chandeliers

and candelabras to control lighting effects during rituals was frequently noted by informants. All of these were supposed to contribute to the warmth, the projection of an effusive spirituality in church ceremonies. It was precisely this difference between the warmth of colors and lighting at St. Markela and the supposed coolness of the blues and wooden pews at SS. Catherine and George which led many informants to reject the new church and attend the schismatic rebel one.

There seems to be a pattern in the importance and meaning assigned to these elements in the church building and its use of space. The first is the feeling of control -- control over the space rather than control exercised over the individual group through the use of space. The second is the quest for legitimacy and power through the purity of traditions--known cues and codes for conduct with acknowledged virtues through past myths and legends and written histories of the glory of the ancient and medieval churches in Greece. The third is a sense of overlap between sacred or spiritual worlds and secular, mundane ones, as well as the related overlap between individuals and the group, a physical meshing of two divided realities into a single unified one.

How are these in any way expressions of the asymmetry of relations within the private and public worlds of these Greeks? They are and they are not! They are both reflections of the way the world is ordered and expressions of the females' quest for how it should be or for control over that order. First, we must remember that St. Markela, until very recently, appealed primarily, if not exclusively to Greek women, and mostly of immigrant backgrounds. In their private lives these women were subjected to the subordination of their fathers and later their husbands. When men who dropped their wives or mothers off at the church were asked why they did not attend, they frequently answered

that the church was too feminine, too warm. It was precisely this warmth which attracted the women--and which they may have in fact created by their presence. These women, we might suspect, have two quests in life--one is to find a public arena in which to perform for others and with others in some community beyond that of the immediate nuclear and extended family; the other is to control that arena and give their own positions in life importance and power through it. In St. Markela they were in comfortable control over the space (it is not too massive for their small stature and limited worldly exposure). They are in reasonable control over their relations with other women in the highly structured rituals, and the congested rhythmic performance of these rituals offered a symbollic, spiritual sense of commonality and community. And finally, the extolling of the traditions and the links with an honored past grant them a sense of rightness, if not rightousness, and a feeling of power in at least a mythical or spiritual world, if not in their real secular worlds.

It should be remembered that for the men, both in Greece and here, the church represented the one arena in which women could gain support (supernatural assistance or power) for their interests and an advantage over the men (Blum and Blum, 1970). Female connection with supernatural forces could bring dishonor and disgrace upon the male. The belief in this linkage between women and the gods provided women with perhaps their primary protection against male abuse.

In both Greece and among these Greeks in Astoria, however, there also existed a similar dichotomization and organization of social life, with male subordination of females and private, kinship-oriented domains dominating public ones, and with men usually and traditionally subjected to the arbitrary and capricious will of external administrators, landlords, rulers, tax collectors,

and so on both during Turkish occupation and even after. Male exploitation by the larger society seemed to have been transformed into male exploitation of females in the local society. The only inversion of this ranked hierarchy and asymmetry of roles occurred in the female dominated arena of the church and with the help of the supernatural forces. It was there, as well, that the supernatural control of males paralleled that of the larger society's control of the male--and hence made both forbidding and dangerous domains, as well as warm, sensuous, emotional, and lacking a mechanism which manly orderliness and control could manage.

How do costumes, adornments, hair styles, mannerisms, and strategies of the Bishop and priests consistently express the asymmetry, and particularly the inversion of power positions of males and females within that asymmetrical structure, which we developed above? The one comment which continued to fascinate me was the deacon's concern with the fact that his boss had made him shave off his beard. Another scene which intrigued me was watching the Bishop meticulously comb his long white beard, in full view of about thirty women and perhaps three men. A third instance was when one of my assistants made me carefully note how similar the Bishop's dress--his robes and long skirts--was to the old women who came to worship and to the nuns who live with him, as well as to the dress of widows in Greece.

The beard, its length and care, and its public presentation were crucial parts of these religious leaders' costumes--of their public images--their statements of themselves to others. Hair had to be long, not shaven or cut. The bishops, priests and the monks dress were associated with both the old women and the widow. All three are considered, in Greece, as sexually and politically neutral.

As intermediaries between the women and the supernatural forces which link these women into a community and give them individual strength against the males who dominated them and against the forces of nature which might attack them, these religious leaders dressed in ways which communicated their intervening stature and their ambiguous position between nature and a supernature--female and male. To the males in the community these priests and the Bishop were viewed with anxiety and ambivalence precisely because they control that which subverts the wives from them and because they (particularly the monks and Bishop) are sexually neutral yet not politically neutered. They are potentially dangerous yet out of male control. Men and priests operate in two different structural streams.

These religious leaders also have behavioral strategies and methods for achieving their goals which are alien to these Greek males, yet quite similar to those practiced by the females. The Bishop is considered a selfless, giving, martyr-like super-human, working for the spiritual without concern for his own human needs. His tactics for achieving these spiritual quests are those of devotion, prayer, monasticism. Monetary or material needs are supplied through his selfless appeals for contributions from church participants. Religious vehicles are relied on primarily, if not exclusively, to raise funds to support the church. The Bishop paints icons and sells them for the church. It is this kind of self-effacing spirituality in his pleas which is both appealing to women and repugnant to many men. One wonders if it is not appealing to women because it is analogous if not an exact duplicate of their own strategies for supporting their own needs--extolling their selflessness, their devotions, their labors, their sacrifices to their husbands, in order to exact love, affection, praise and support.

These tactics are certainly not the overt, business-like, materially-oriented, market-oriented approach of their husbands. While the Bishop and priests seem to function as redistributors, using personal appeal and charisma to extract resources and returning intangible spiritual "goods" for these resources, the average layman is engaged in a daily struggle, against controlling forces beyond this influence, to extract sufficient resources to exchange in a universalistic, generalized marketplace for sustenance and pleasure. The goods received are mundane and tangible. The technique for achieving them is straightforward, and without the powers of personal appeal, only of hard labor.

Again, I believe we see the nature of the hierarchy in the world of these Greek males and the inversion of this hierarchy in the church expressed in these concerns with and meaning assigned to the dress, hair and beard, and strategies of these religious leaders. These leaders are males acting like women, giving women strength, community and power and extracting from them economic resources. They have symbolically switched to a female's position, using all the cues and codes needed to appeal to them and join with them into a community. Even the fact that, in spite of female disguise, these are men exploiting females again, the costumes and mannerisms make this exploitation a balanced reciprocity --one which grants women something which they do not get from their negative reciprocity with males in the non-church world.

It is precisely in the non-spiritual aspects of the church that the religious leaders shift back from their semi-female state to exert their prerogatives as males. Particularly I am referring to their control over the secular operations of church buildings and church policies. The small parish council, parishioners informed me, was one of the few arenas in which some men participated, under the leadership if not the actual control of the Bishop. Traditionally,

control over the operations of the church buildings rested with the village council which owned church buildings and ran church ıscal operations. In this case, however, the Bishop raised the monies to buy the buildings and still exercised considerable influence over decisions by the Parish Council which might effect the fiscal spending.

Apart from spiritual concerns of the church, women tend to participate primarily in charitable functions and the few luncheons served during holiday seasons. They are again politically excluded from decisions affecting the church or its religious policies.

It almost appears as if the symbolic status of Bishops and priests--i.e., of men in women's dress, particularly in the dress of old, impotent women, of powerful women, of hairy, warm, uncontrolled, earthy women--parallels the dichomization of the church into a spiritual-female dominated sector and a secular-male oriented one, with the religious leaders bridging the two and controlling both. For the women it is a "Sady Hawkins" like stage in which they can reverse the world and control their relations with others. For the men, it is a secular arena with only minimal benefits for them in a world dominated by economic and political forces beyond their personal control and that of the religious leaders and their institution. Hence, there is limited participation of Greek males in this church for either purpose--spiritual or practical.

How do these patterns between symbolic order and social hierarchies differ from or resemble those gathered from St. Demitrios? In contrast to the sexually segregated, ranked arrangement of social and spiritual domains in the lives of members of St. Markela, the Greeks attending St. Demitrios seem to live in a more balanced, less segregated, more egalitarian world. Public and private worlds seem to merge and blend together as males and

females, parents and children seem to relax rigid divisions and rankings ordering social relations between them. Relations within the church, moreover, as well as the position and role of priests within its structural order similarly appear to reflect or parallel these modifications or role rearrangements, and hence to similarly lose their ambivalent status as half-men, half-women; half in this world and half in the next.

In the case of these Greeks life no longer, or perhaps never did, center exclusively and preferably around the nuclear family, the kinship group along bilateral lines, or even simply other Greeks. In the case of the family, personal preferences assume increasing importance in the decisions of individuals, men and women, to maintain a relationship with a particular kinsmen. Friends are considered as important, if not more important than kinsmen for emotional support (friendship), companionship, and even for business or political ventures. In some instances where brothers lived in apartments owned by another brother, animosities, often hidden in public encounters, intensified as the economic exigencies of operating apartments or houses necessitated rent increases or threw individuals into the roles of landlords responsible for the upkeep of a building. In other illustrations, mothers or mothers-in-law were tolerated by particular individuals because they were useful babysitters for a working wife--not because of any particular recognition of the obligations to extended kin or of the emotional love for the mothers. The tensions emerging from extended households were frequent topics of conversation. Positive values assigned to kinship relations were rarely considered important in our conversations. Only the burdensome aspects of kin-ties and the obligations such relationships incurred were considered worthy of mention.

Friends, on the other hand, appear elevated in stature. They permitted

individuals maximum flexibility in defining obligations with minimal liability in friendships which failed. In many instances, friends were in fact defined in this manner. Social occasions--particularly those unrelated to the formal ritual patterns of religious ceremonials--centered on relations with friends, with the exceptional inclusion of those relations who were categorized as friends because personal preferences generated an emotional link between two individuals. Ritual occasions, on the other hand, still focused on familial links. Often, however, some special friends were included into the kinship nexus or a ritual event was celebrated first with kinsmen and subsequently with non-kin. This was specifically the case with one Easter celebration I attended and with descriptions of several New Year's celebrations by informants.

These Greeks also preferred to work with or for non-kinsmen and to employ kinsmen only when extraordinary circumstances pressured them to do so. Normatively, however, individuals preferred to avoid economic connections to kinsmen. If these Greeks had an aversion to let strangers know their income, their financial situations, or their successes, they had an even greater aversion to let family members impinge on these incomes, endeavors or successes. To aid a family member was still considered appropriate behavior. But, to employ one was considered a grave error in business judgment. This is not to suggest that such situations did not arise where individuals employed kinsmen or dealt with them in business. Yet, both norms and expectations suggested, and experience frequently confirmed, that such links jeopardized an economic enterprise.

Part of this increasing independence of these Greeks from kinship obligations, I should note, stems from the increasing independence of many of their kinsmen, particularly their parents and their parents'siblings, from

economic support of their children. Conversely, part of this independence of children emerges from their own economic freedom from parental supervision (Tavuchis, 1969).

In this first domain kinsmen haven't necessarily been demoted, nor have kinship obligations, per se, but non-kin and selectivity have been elevated in importance. Selectivity, not ascribed obligation, has assumed increased respectibility as an acceptable basis for socializing and sharing. A similar shift has occurred in the relative status of men and women, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters. Flexibility, not rigidity, achieved stature, not ascribed position, and equality, not domination, seem to characterize the patterns of change which have occurred in the respective roles and obligations between these categories of people. Women no longer held roles exclusively limited to the home or the church. Men were no longer exclusive controllers of public life nor dominators of private ones either. While women's work in the home has not been eliminated from their list of expected responsibilities, nor necessarily elevated in stature either, women can and frequently did participate in those spheres which, among members of St. Markela, were exclusively held by males. The relative status of public and private has not shifted. Women's stature has changed. Women work, participate with men in political structures in the church, serve with men on school boards, and socialize with men in bowling leagues, at parties, at dinner dances, in political fund raising events, and so forth. Men, on the other hand, also participate in what were previously considered female-dominated domains. Men not only attend church and participate in the rituals, but also aid women in fund-raising activities and in decisions regarding the education of their children. While most men did not enjoy doing housework, some admitted that they help with some of the work,

including cleaning the table, shopping for food, and particularly with cooking meals when wives worked.

Brothers and sisters also found that changes have occurred in their own relationships and responsibilities. While some brothers felt obliged to discover whom their sisters were dating and what the reputations of these boys were, others felt that their sisters'private affairs were no longer open for scrutiny by brothers. Brothers no longer felt responsibility for protecting female virtue or respectibility. Often, brothers and sisters felt close personal affection for each other, as did brothers for each other and sisters for their sisters. But, "traditional" attitudes subordinating sisters to their brothers no longer held firm.

Children, moreover, were receiving increased recognition as individuals with personal needs which could not be categorically ignored for the sake of familial or parental considerations.

This balancing of the relative position in the roles of kin and non-kin, males and females, parents and children, brothers and sisters, found further articulation in the evaluation of Greeks and non-Greeks. The world of these members of St. Demitrios was not concentrically circled into various levels of we's and they's hierarchically ordered. Rather, the world seemed to be a vast expanse of categories of individuals from which particular members could be included in an individual's social universe principally on the basis of personal taste, not on some preconceived ranking of preferred and non-preferred participants. Admittedly, for certain events some individuals or categories of individuals were preferred associates because of their ascribed status--weddings, funerals, god-parenthood often prescribed who would be invited. But, in selecting associates, marriage partners, business clients, political spokesmen,

informants repeatedly emphasized the fact that their individual respect for, love of, or dislike for a particular person determined their association or lack of association with him or her. This was similarly the case for including non-Greeks or Greeks into a social network. The varied nature of individual networks attests to the degree to which these selection processes operated among these Greeks. Some had large numbers of non-Greek friends and business associates. Others belonged to both Greek and non-Greek voluntary associations. Still others expressed mixed sentiments about their children marrying non-Greeks, while some were candid in their feelings that marriage was no longer a matter of ethnic considerations as much as personal taste. The very fact that Astoria was an ethnically mixed community was often cited to strengthen an individual's conviction that a culturally heterogeneous society, both in personal levels and for society as a whole, was a healthy, positive thing, and not something dangerous to the individual or to Greeks.

The occupational profile of these Greeks spanned the spectrum from professionals to blue collar workers. Despite the widely ranging composition of jobs evident here, however, most of these Greeks seemed to share a common sense that they were moving somewhere in their jobs upward, outward, towards a better future and, secondly, that they themselves were exerting tremendous influence and control over this momentum. That is to say that they viewed their system as open, not closed around them, and their efforts to change their position, improve their status, accumulate capital, and succeed however they might define success, were doing just that--succeeding. Whether they defined their positions as middle-class or not seemed less crucial than their own perceptions of the class structure as an open one in which they had some power in determining what happened to them. Sometimes they recognized frustrations

in exerting this power; but they did not deny that their destinies were in their own hands and that their failures were of their own making.

In the political domain their attitude was much the same. Several individuals had already attempted to run for political office. None had won, but this did not daunt them. All of them recognized that they had to have the support of non-Greeks as well as Greeks, in these political campaigns, and consequently sought links into these non-Greek worlds. Most also felt that to make the political machine responsive to their needs they had to infiltrate its operations and control parts of it. It was neither alien to them nor in complete control over them. Only their own physical and financial limitations held them back, and the limitations of belonging to a small ethnic group in the midst of larger ones in a city whose political structure operates along ethnic political lines.

Since St. Demitrios has just completed the construction of a new church, SS. Catherine and George, I have selected to use it to consider some of the symbols articulated through the manipulation of space, color and age in the decision to build a new branch and to design it in very particular ways. The first factor to consider is that the decision to build a new branch came about because the old one was "too small," too old," or too close to the elevated subway, and hence too noisy. The new church is seen, by many, to be a much superior size and shape. It is more spacious both when empty and when filled with parishioners. It is more open, more airy, more massive--all things which make it more proper for these Greeks. If the old church became suffocatingly filled with incense and the smell of candles during rituals, the new one was healthier, airier, and superior for both reasons.

Secondly, if St. Markela was considered pure because it was old, St. Demitrios was considered impure or unsatisfactory for the very same reason.

The new church was designed to compensate for that impurity in the older building. With youth came wisdom--not immaturity. With youth came beauty--not crassness.

Thirdly, in both the new and the old branches of St. Demitrios the rows of pews, and hence of parishioners were rigidly fixed to spaces ordered in the church. The problem in the older building was that too many people had to crowd into the limited number of pews. With the addition of the new building there was adequate space for everyone to sit at "proper" distances from each other and hence at proper distances from the priests and the altar. Further, there were in both branches, a spatial division of roles between ritual or spiritual ones and secular or administrative ones.

And finally, the selection of cool blues to decorate the church's interior completes what seem to be a pattern of decisions to design a new church in such a way that parishoner concerns with proper space around them, between them, and between themselves and their religious leaders could be maintained, and that parishioner concerns with youth, newness and a break with the past all found articulation. Further, and perhaps most importantly, all the overlap in social roles and responsibilities in private lives were expressed not in the merger of scenes within a single spatial domain but with the separation of scenes in isolated spatial domains.

Are these factors symbolic expressions of the suggested symmetry in relationships described for these Greeks before? We argue that in the demand for adequate space is a demand for an equal share of space by individuals convinced that there is enough of everything in this world so that they can share it equally. Yet, they want to make certain that they don't lose control over it to the vagrancies of inadequate space. In the demand for newness is also

a demand by individuals increasingly free of traditional obligations to family, kin, and fellow Greeks for a new arena in which they can articulate this freedom—free from past traditions and from the control of older segments of the community with their symbolic allegiances to and identification with the older church building. The selection of "cool," perhaps even "manly" colors articulates the increasing role of men in the decision-making operations of the institution--or at least the imposition of a masculine orientation to the previously female dominated domain.

The separation of the church buildings, in both instances, into specific spaces to serve particular functions is a reversal of the overlap of social spaces in the world in which these Greeks now live. If men and women are working together, or at least both participating in the world of work, and if parents and children are now competing for control over decisions affecting each others lives, and if brothers and sisters no longer recognize their separate and unequal statuses in the family, and if brothers view each other as competing individuals and not as siblings sharing responsibilities, and if Greek and non-Greek worlds are mixing interchangeably in private and public life, then, perhaps the separation of domains in the church building and in the church functions provide an arena in which a balance can be reconstructed by individuals between the overlap in one world and the quest for some systematic segregative ordering in the other. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the segregation of space according to functions reflects the dichotomization of spiritual and secular roles performed by the church, and in a much more mundane sense simply acts to facilitate the performance of these specific functions by the church community.

Perhaps the selection of attire and the strategies to pursue particular goals on the part of these priests at St. Demitrios gives us clues to which of

the above relationships accurately expresses the meaning underlying the ordering of space, color and age in these buildings.

When we described the priests at St. Demitrios, the elements which we highlighted, and which were highlighted for us by various parishioners, were the priest's business suits, their clean-shaven faces, and their stylish hair combs. When we considered their styles of leadership we characterized them as businessmen, pragmatic and materialistic, manly and energetic, with subtle powers to influence individuals both within the local church community and in the larger administrative agencies and communities in the city itself. Particularly in the case of Father Poulos, we seemed to be dealing with the administrator of a major business concern who was more concerned with the expansion of his base of supporters, the profit and loss statement of the enterprise, the status of the church in the eyes of other churches and religious denominations in the community, and his own prestige and influence with Greeks and particularly with non-Greeks in the upper reaches of local, borough, and city-wide politics. His appeal was not based on his warm maternal, self-effacing appeal, nor his martyr-like sacrifices, but rather on his manly, practical, self-seeking efforts which seemed to parallel those of most of his constituents. It is quite possibly for this reason alone that he was a man of great controversy in the community--both the St. Demitrios community and the Astoria community at large. Definitions of proper behavior for "priests" seemed to vary extensively, as did consequent feelings towards this priest for what some informants praised and others condemned as appropriate or inappropriate behavior.

Together, both Father Poulos' dress, his clean shaven face, his stylish hair cut, and his strategies for dealing with the problems of the church and its members might shed light on our previous hypothesis about the changing

or lack of hierarchy in the lives of these parishioners. While the Bishop and priests at St. Markela seemed to clearly stand as half-men, half-women bridging the gap between two highly segregated, ranked spheres, Father Poulos and the priests at St. Demitrios seem to stand more clearly in their own world as men. They are married. They wear nothing, except a hardly noticeable clerical collar, to distinguish themselves from other men. They behave like they assume all the other upwardly mobile men in the community are behaving, as each of these men supposedly struggle to improve his economic position. Their definitions of the problems facing the church and its community are viewed in secular, practical terminology, not in spiritual or mythical concepts. They deal with these problems with "innovations," things which are new, current, not traditional. Further, they recognize that, while they are competing with other priests from other Greek Orthodox Churches and with priests from other denominations for control over their resources--namely parishioners--they can win. In their behavior and dress they communicate a typical or stereotypical example of proper behavior for their supporters and, for those who endorse them, they serve as illustrations of the successes which such behavior can produce. They are both a model of propriety and a model for dealing with exigencies.

Further, the difference in dress between the Bishop and priests at St. Markela and the priest at St. Demitrios parallels the differences in dress, as well as in roles, of women at these two churches. While the Bishop and priests at St. Markela so obviously resemble the women, and the priests at St. Demitrios look like men, the women at St. Demitrios have also changed their dress to appear both more "modern" and "urbane" and often to look more "masculine" with the addition of an occasional slack suit on some of the women, not in church but in daily life.

If there has been or is an equality in the roles and relationships between segments of the society which participates in St. Demitrios, then perhaps the reeducation of the priests from a half-man, half-woman, half deity position to one which is completely consistent to their fully male fully human stature as primus inter pares in the real world is symbolically expressed in their dress and behavior. Perhaps, too, the search on the part of women as well as men for power in the secular world, not the spiritual one, is articulated in the demotion or redefinition of the status of the priest as no longer a tool through which females could gain power but another male who is competing with females for control over the males, and any financial resources they can authorize.

Chapter VI

Conclusion

This study represents an attempt to connect differentials in symbolism exhibited by two Greek Orthodox church communities with contrasts in their respective social structures. Contrasts in their symbolic expressions of Greek ethnicity reflect, we argue, alternative patterns of public and private life styles. On one level, the study attempted to link these contrasting life styles with differential strategies of adaptation to life in America--particularly in light of shifting demands by American society for particular responses on the part of immigrants and members of ethnic groups.

On a second level, the study suggested that divergent forms of social structure were rooted in the class position of church members. Perceptions of power and powerlessness, images of open, equal opportunity and closed inequality, feelings of being part of the larger social system or separate, by choice or in fact, from it, seemed to combine to press Greeks into one religious community or the other. Symbols of community in each case were considered public expressions of inner private life styles shaped by external pressures of socio-economic class. The two hypotheses offered in this study dichotomize the problem, separating the individual's concerns with adapting to a larger social system from implicit organizational forces emerging from a seemingly coercive class structure. The purpose of this conclusion is to reintegrate structural factors with adaptive strategies and suggest ways in which this study might shed additional insight into the processes through which immigrants and their children have adapted to life in America.

If we review the literature on ethnic or religious groups in America,

this study seems to offer an unorthodox attempt to analyze the intersecting influence of ethnicity and class on symbols of religious identity. That is not to imply that there is a dearth of literature on ethnicity, class or religion in the social sciences. To the contrary, research is extensive, documentation is voluminous. Yet, there is limited effort to understand the interaction of each factor with the others, or the implications of all three for symbolic expressions of individual and group identities. Prior to and immediately following the Second World War, research typically segmented ethnicity, class, and religion, treating each as if it were an isolate. When the intersection between two variables was explored, the third was ignored.

Case studies and theoretical efforts to classify patterns and predict processes of ethnic group adjustment to American life were typical of this peculiar approach to the problem. Groups were described as if all members, all segments, conformed to an ideal stereotype. Deviations from the norm were not alternatives but perversions. This is clearly evident in the efforts of early theoreticians to construct typologies and predictive models of immigrant, minority or ethnic group responses to conditions of subordination. Park (1921), for example, in his early efforts to understand the life cycle of minority groups, identified ethnic groups in terms of dominant social patterns and cultural trademarks. Deviations from these types were recognized but nominally discarded as irrelevant for his understanding of processes of social change. Underlying Park's disregard for internal heterogeneity in ethnic populations was the assumption that social differentiation amongst ethnic populations could not continue. Individuals who deviated from a general trend of acculturation, discarding ethnically distinctive traits in the process, were out of the main current drawing minorities into America's dominant social system. Social processes were operating to destroy

the integrity of immigrant communities. Individuals who persisted in upholding distinctive customs were in a temporary stage which would be corrected as the operation of social processes inevitably leveled all groups.

Louis Wirth's (1949) subsequent efforts to classify types of minority responses to subordination followed in Park's path. Wirth similarly perceived social groups as if they were homogeneous categories with dominant structural and cultural forms patterning group life. Wirth suggested that group responses could fit into four possible categories: pluralist,assimilationist, militant and secessionist. Regardless of what particular individuals might be doing, groups could be classified into one or another category. Group movement from one stage to another was inevitable, as immigrants and minorities attempted to cope with a dominant host society. Transitional stages were possible but not significant to his conceptualization of the transformation process. Similarly, factors contributing to deviations from normative types were equally unimportant.

Subsequent research efforts to clarify these typologies, such as those of Schermerhorn (1967), Rose (1964), and Rinder (1965), continued to assume that ethnic, immigrant, or minority groups could best be understood as if they were homogeneous, with all members progressing, performing, changing at a similar rate and along similar paths. Warner and Srole's (1945) extensive effort to measure degrees of progress through these stages of becoming an "American" is perhaps one of the more elaborate investigations using this modal image of ethnic group behavior, The limitations of their assumptions that "the future of American ethnic groups seems to be limited; it is likely that they will be quickly absorbed" (Warner and Srole, 1945) is evident when such assertions are juxtaposed against the resurgence of ethnicity in the late 1960's and in the growing body of documentation demonstrating the persistence of ethnic enclaves and culturally distinct communities in the 1970's.

Perhaps one of the earliest recognitions of the limits of these models is the theoretical study conducted by Milton Gordon (1961, 1964) in which he at least addresses the possibility that ethnic groups exhibit heterogeneous patterns of behavior. Gordon's concept of the eth-class acknowledged the influence of these two factors on patterns of adaptation among immigrant, ethnic, and minority groups in American life. His extensive historical discussion of early efforts to understand the transformation of America's diverse populations into a nation-state highlighted the limitations of such unilinear ideologies as "Anglo-conformity," "Melting-pot" and "Cultural Pluralism." Gordon concluded that "Anglo-Conformity" was a barely successful strategy in America, despite the fact that many immigrants during the 19th century adapted themselves to the general life styles and cultural norms of the dominant WASP society. The concept of the "Melting Pot," he suggested, was perhaps more a myth than a social reality, with all the positive values and inherent limitations of myths. Cultural pluralism, and as he documented, structural pluralism, were facts of social life long before they became theories of adjustment. In the place of these confused models of what was happening and what should have occurred to America's many minorities, Gordon pointed out that acculturation, or behavioral assimilation, had taken place in America to a considerable degree. On the other hand, structural assimilation, with several important exceptions, had not been extensive. The two exceptions were, in the first case, the intellectuals, and secondly, the supposition that nationality groups were gradually merging into religious groups along a tri-partite structure: The Protestant, Catholic and Jew.

Gordon's explanation of the reasons for these developments in America is important for our consideration. Structural assimilation in America had been

retarded, he argued, by both the majority and the minority groups themselves. The dominant group rarely offered invitations for minority members to participate in primary groups; minority groups offered refuge in ethnic communality for those rejected by the majority. Yet, within both majority and minority, class divisions segmented each group into ever smaller, more reinforcing social enclaves, with structures and social networks, symbols and common life styles offering comfortable settings for interaction. Gordon consequently perceived groups as non-homogeneous, class-stratified populations. Class was acknowledged as a cross-cutting factor serving to isolate members of the same ethnic population from each other. Ethnic group members remained separate from the majority group. They also remained isolated from other ethnic groups, except under conditions where common religion possibly permitted intermarriage, interaction in common organizations, and perhaps a sense of shared identity replacing more traditional nationality.

Gordon did not pursue his discussion of the eth-class further. He described, for example, the fact that lower-class segments of ethnic groups tended to remain more closely attached to traditional cultural forms than their middle and upper-class counterparts. Yet, he failed to explore reasons why such a relationship should exist. Do middle class ethnics share a common middle class American culture while lower class ethnics seek something special in an ethnicly distinctive culture, we might ask? Are middle class ethnics more "assimilated," and if so, why? Does "assimilation" follow or precede entrance into the middle class?

The importance of answers to these questions becomes apparent in Herberg's research on the tripartite religious divisions discussed above by

Gordon (1955) and in the research by Sklare (1955) on Conservative Judaism. Herberg's study was an expansion of research conducted by Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy on intermarriage trends in New Haven (1944). In both cases their data suggested that ethnic identities in America, previously based on national origins, were gradually dissolving. They were being replaced, it appeared, by categories of religious identification which were greater in breadth and more focused in organizational appeal. America, moreover, tended to disparage ethnic organizations but encourage religious affiliation. Herberg argued that religious denominations, such as Protestant, Catholic and Jew, offered legitimate organizational contexts and positive social identities for those stigmatized by Polish, Italian, Lithuanian, German or Scandanavian affiliations, for example. Similarly, Jews of Sephardic, German, and Eastern European ancestry seemed to come together into single, overlapping communities, with sectarian distinctions, such as Conservative, Reform and Orthodox serving to establish boundaries around subgroupings.

That such distinctions were more complex than the triple-melting pot suggested by Kennedy and Herberg is quite apparent. This was certainly true in the case of the Catholic Church and its various nationalities. But, it is also evident that Herberg disregarded the fact that class distinctions clearly separated religious communities even within these larger denominational categories, e.g., the various Protestant sects and Jews. Niebuhr (1924) had commented extensively on the role of class in the fragmentation of religious communities in his early study on denominational pluralism among Protestant sects. Pope (1942) offered further documentation on the relationship between

class stratification and individual participation in different sects within Protestants in America. Socio-economic mobility, Pope suggested, resulted in individual shifts from a particular sect to a sect more commensurate with an individual's new status. Further, group mobility coincided with the transformation of a sect into a church. This was accompanied by the introduction of institutional underpinnings essential to the transmission of religious values and theology to succeeding generations participating in the religious community.

Herberg's thesis is similarly limited by his failure to consider the "ethnic church." Sklare (1955) discusses this "ethnic church" as it applies to Conservative Judaism, in particular, to all Jewish denominations in general, and to other religious groups, such as Protestant, Lutheran, German and to Armenian, Italian and Puerto Rican Catholics. In each case, and in others like them, religious institutions did not destroy nationality but interlocked considerations of special ancestry with those of religious theology. In America, writes Sklare, this type of church is unique. It has arisen because of the peculiar situation whereby ethnic groups were essentially minority groups, subordinate to a majority group assumed to be "non-ethnic." These groups were first churches but secondly had the additional task of preserving a particular ethnic sub-culture. While Sklare agreed with Herberg that religion was an acceptable method of group differentiation in America, religious categories were not, as Herberg had argued, destroying ethnic identities. Rather, religious groups and ethnic groups were mutually undergoing transformations to find new contexts in which to preserve old, ethnic enclaves. There is little agreement among Jews, writes Sklare, over what kind of content to give to these ethnic-churches. Some advocate a strong theological orientation; others wish to compromise religious identification with secular or community interests which would reduce

theological concerns and an image of Jews as a religious community; a third group see Jewish religious identities as a weak remnant of a fading past which must be kept on the surface to sustain Jewish cultural traditions. How these differences might be linked to class positions in the Jewish population is not considered by Sklare.

Clearly, Sklare recognized the linkages between ethnicity and religious identities, perhaps as only a scholar of Judaism would. Yet, the data on Protestantism and on Catholicism similarly suggest that the ethnic-church is part of the American immigrants' strategy for adapting to American life, and that these churches are frequented by members of an ethnic group who tend to share similar status in a class hierarchy. Hence, while there is little direct inquiry into how these three factors interact or how they ultimately influence the symbolic articulation of a groups's identity, there is indirect awareness that ethnicity, religion and class are cross-cutting factors which are important to our understanding of individual and group processes of symbol selection and cultural identification.

Our own study consequently stands somewhat alone. Yet it is hardly definitive. America, from the early 1800's to the present, has been a society undergoing almost uninterrupted expansion, rapid social change, high mobility, intense urbanization and successive waves of immigration (from which its working class was continuously re-recruited.) The absence of a single tradition or a stable class structure, the promotion of denominational competition, and the expectation of growth and development fostered a continuous process of sect formation, fragmentation, and their evolution into religious denominations. Conditions underlying sect emergence were ripe. Changes in the economic positions of a particular group, or a segment of that group were continuously

occurring. Social relations between groups and among sub-groups were rarely stabilized. Particular groups were rendered marginal. Other, previously marginal groups were catapulted to new-found stature. Insecurity, differential status anxiety, cultural conflict, prompted a need for readjustment. New social positions demanded new cultural interpretations and new spiritual evaluations of unfamiliar experiences. The transformations affected individuals,occupational groups, social communities. In America, these groups sought and found a vehicle for establishing renewed order within religious organizations. Ethnicity hence merged with religion into a new structural form -- class segmented, ethno-religious communities. Divergent life styles, differential rates of social mobility, conflicting images of the world and of one's position in that world led to diverse interpretations of individual and group positions. Contrasting symbolic legitimation expressed in religious idiom of new social orders, new world views, new cosmologies and individual identities reflected those highly stressful, tense, continuously changing social contexts.

The history of Greek immigration, settlement and adaptation in America, as well as the growing importance of the Greek Orthodox church as the "ethnic church" for Greeks in this country, clearly followed this pattern of challenge and fragmentation in the face of opportunity and inhibition. There was never a moment during which Greeks were at peace with the larger society. There was rarely a point when Greeks agreed over how to cope with the demands, and the potentialities of that larger society. Nor was there a period of calm within Greek communities themselves. New immigrants challenged old; American-born children challenged their parents; upward mobility strained families, damaged organizations, threatened religious structures, created anxious, ambivalent individuals. If we have correctly perceived what has occurred in general, and

particularly among Greeks in Astoria today, class differences splintered Greek communities into smaller social isolates. Each sought support in different organizational settings. Each created social boundaries around their enclaves. Each selected particular sets of symbols, codes, patterns of behavior, of dress, of building design, of value orientations and standards of conduct which granted, in symbolic format, rational intelligibility, legitimacy, consistency, to the divergent life styles derived from their respective positions in a class hierarchy.

Barth (1969) has criticized traditional studies of ethnic groups which viewed cultural phenomena as primary, not derivative, in the formation and functioning of ethnic groups. Boundaries, suggests Barth, are the keynotes to our investigation of ethnic groups. The existence of an ethnic group depends on two criteria: self-ascription and ascription by others. Once conceived in name, once social boundaries are identified, the cultural artifacts identified as meaningful by the actors themselves become subjects worthy of investigation. What must then be determined is why certain cultural forms, certain symbols and sets of symbols with an internal coherence and structure of their own are identified as meaningful by members of an ethnic category. Ethnicity consequently is something cultural.

What, then, influences the structural order of social relations operating within the boundaries defined as meaningful for and by members of an ethnic group? Is the structural order rooted in the relationships emerging from individual and collective positions in a social hierarchy, particularly one defined on the basis of socio-economic class, as Edward Robbins (1975) has recently suggested? The differences between the two symbolic systems selected by Greeks, different kinds of Greeks in Astoria, to publicly articulate their ethnic identities, to define boundaries around their social groups, to rationalize and

render intelligible their private life styles, can best be seen as contrasting world views which emerge from the divergent life styles associated with the particular class positions of these two groups of Greeks. The two groups lived different lives. Their differences emerged out of the chaos inherent in conditions of rapid influx, settlement and outmigration generated by the new immigration of the late 1960's. But, most importantly, their differences rested on their particular perceptions of where they each stood in a hierarchical structure: on the top, in the middle, or on the bottom. Their solutions to their positions were either in spiritual or in secular sources of reaffirmation of their personal self-worth. Their salvation rested in either economic opportunity and a secularized assimilationist religious institution or in spiritual opportunity and an elitist, sectarian, separatist, religious institution. Assimilation and incapsulation, however, were intervening strategies derived from positions in the class hierarchy. Neither processes of adaptation, such as assimilation and incapsulation, nor the symbolic systems which on the surface seem to be associated with these processes can be understood without consideration of the underlying structural orders which are rooted in a class hierarchy.

In light of Sklare's discussion of the internal conflicts within American Judaism over how to best use the ethnic-church, and simultaneously, how to best cope with life in the United States, we might urge, in conclusion, that future research seek to test our propositions cross-culturally: among other ethnic groups in America, among Greeks in other contexts, and among other ethnic populations in Western and non-Western societies. Perhaps through controlled comparisons we might clarify the relationship we have suggested between class, ethnicity, religion and symbolic systems.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamic, Louis
1974 Greek Immigration in the United States. The Commonweal 33:336-368.

Anderson, Charles H.
1970 White Protestant Americans. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Andreades, A.
1906 The Currant Crisis in Greece. Economic Journal 16:41-51.

Barth, Fredrik
1969 Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. Boston: Little Brown and Company.

Benz, Ernst
1957 The Eastern Orthodox Church: Its Thought and Life. Garden City: Anchor Books.

Blum, Richard and Eva Blum
1970 The Dangerous Hour: The Lore of Crisis and Mystery in Rural Greece. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Braden, William
1967 The Private Sea and the Search for God. Chicago: Quadrangle Press.

Bruner, Edward M.
1973 Kin and Non-kin. In Urban Anthropology: Cross-cultural Studies of Urbanization. Aidan Southall, Ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burlami, T.
1899 Overproduction of Greek Currants. Economic Journal IX:634-651.

Carpenter, Niles
1920 Immigrants and their Children. U.S. Bureau of the Census Monograph VII. Washington, D.C.

Chock, Phyllis Pease
1966 Greeks in the United States. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. The University of Chicago.

Clogg, Richard and George Yannopoulos
1972 Greece Under Military Rule. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Clogg, Richard
1972 The Ideology of the Revolution of 21 April 1967. In Greece Under Military Rule. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Constant, Theodore M.
1945 Employment and Business of the Greeks in the United States. Athene VI (Winter, 1945).

Constant, Theodore M.
1946 Employment and Business of the Greeks in the United States. Athene VII (Summer, 1946; Autumn, 1946).

Constant, Theodore M.
1947 Employment and Business of the Greeks in the United States. Athene VII (Winter, 1947).

Constant, Theodore M.
1947 Greek Immigration and its Causes. Athene VII (Spring, 1947).

Constant, Theodore M.
1948 Life of Earlier Greek Immigrants in the United States. Athene VII (Winter, 1948).

Constant, Theodore M.
1950 Greek American Colonies, Churches and Schools in the United States. Athene XI (Autumn, 1950).

Constant, Theodore M.
1951 Greek American Colonies, Churches and Schools in the United States. Athene XI (Spring, 1951; Winter, 1951).

Constantakos, Chrysie M.
1971 The American-Greek Sub-Culture: Processes of Continuity. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University.

Douglas, Mary
1966 Purity and Danger. London: routledge & Kegan Paul.

Doukas, Kimon A.
1950 The Story of AHEPA. Athene XI (1950).

Drachsler, Julius
1920 Democracy and Assimilation. In Vlachos, E. The Blending of Immigrant Heritages in America. New York: MacMillan Co.

Duncan, Hugh D.
1968 Symbols in Society. London: Oxford University Press.

Fairchild, H.P.
1911 Greek Immigration to the United States: Economic Causes of Immigration. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Feldstein, Stanley and Lawrence Costello
1974 The Ordeal of Assimilation. Garden City: Anchor Books.

Firth, Raymond
1973 Symbols: Public and Private. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Francis, E.K.
1945 The Nature of the Ethnic Group. American Journal of Sociology 52:393-400.

Gabrielidis, V.
1895 The Overproduction of Greek Currants. Economic Journal V:285-188.

Gage, Nicholas
1971 Portrait of Greece. New York: American Heritage Press.

Gans, Herbert
1962 The Urban Villagers. New York: MacMillan Co.

Geertz, Clifford
1968 Religion as a Cultural System. In Banton, M. Anthropological Approaches to the Study of Religion. London: Tavistock.

Giannakoulis, Theodore
1959 Introduction to the History of Greek-Americans. Argonautes 165-177.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan
1970 Beyond the Melting Pot. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Glazer, Nathan and Daniel P. Moynihan
1974 Ethnicity: Theory and Reality. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gordon, Milton
1964 Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.

Greeley, Andrew
1974 Ethnicity in the United States. New York: Wiley Interscience.

Hall, Edward
1973 Mental Health Research and Out-of-Awareness Cultural Systems. In Cultural Illness and Health, Laura Nader and Thomas W. Maretzki, Eds. Washington D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Herberg, Will
1955 Protestant, Catholic and Jew. New York: Doubleday and Co.

Housepian, Marjorie
1966 The Smyrna Affair. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Hutchinson, Edward P.
1956 Immigrants and Their Children, 1850-1950. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Hutchinson, Edward P., Editor
1968 The New Immigration. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences V. 367.

Jones, Maldwyn Allen
1960 American Immigration. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kennedy, John F.
1970 A Nation of Immigrants. New York: Harper Row.

Kennedy, Ruby Jo Reever
1944 Single or Triple Melting-Pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940. American Journal of Sociology 49:331-339.

Lee, Dorothy
1953 View of the Self in Greek Culture. From Cultural Patterns and Technical Change. World Federation of Mental Health, UNESCO.

Levine, Irving M., Judith Herman and Nancy Seifer
1973 National Project on Ethnic America: interview February, 1973. Reprinted in Feldstein, Stanley and Lawrence Costello The Ordeal of Assimilation. Garden City: Anchor Books (1974).

Levy, Sydelle
1975 Shifting Patterns of Ethnic Identity among the Hassidim. In Bennett, John W. Ed. The New Ethnicity: Prespectives from Ethnology St. Paul: West Publishing.

Lopreato, Joseph
1970 Italian Americans. New York: Random House.

Mantzoro, P.
1966 AHEPA and Across the Years. Glenview, Ill.: Pnyx Publishing Co.

Mistaras, Evangeline
1950 A Study of First and Second Generation Greek Outmarriages in Chicago. Unpublished MA thesis. The University of Chicago.

Mott, Frank
1966 The New Immigration. In The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. Edward P. Hutchinson, Ed. Philadelphia V. 367.

Myrick, D.C. and L. Witucki
1971 How Greece Developed its Agriculture. Foreign Agriculture, Economic Report No. 67, Economic Research Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture.

Nagata, Judith A.
1974 What is a Malay? Situational Selection of Ethnic Identity in a Plural Society. American Ethnologist Vol. I, No. 2.

Niebuhr, H. Richard
1929 The Social Sources of Denominational Pluralism. New York: Holt.

Novak, Michael
1972 Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics. New York: MacMillan Co.

Orans, Martin
1965 The Santal. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Park, Robert and Herbert A. Miller
1921 Old World Traits Transplanted. New York: Harper Bros.

Pope, Liston
1942 Millhands and Preachers. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Price, C.A.
1959 Immigration and Group Settlement. In Borrie, W.D., et al., Eds. The Cultural Integration of Immigrants. Paris: UNESCO.

Rinder, Irwin D.
1965 Minority Orientations: An Approach to Intergroup Relations Theory Through Social Psychology. Phylon XXVI (Spring, 1965).

Robbins, Edward
1975 Ethnicity or Class? Social Relations in a Small Canadian Industrial Community. In Bennett, John W.E. The New Ethnicity: Perspectives from Ethnology. St. Paul: West Publishing.

Rose, Peter
1964 They and We. New York: Random House.

Salutos, Theodore
1964 The Greeks in the United States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sanders, Irwin
1962 Rainbow and the Rock: The People of Rural Greece. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schermerhorn, Richard A.
1967 Polarity in the Approach to Comparative Research in Ethnic Relations. Sociology and Social Research LI (January 1967:235-240).

Schrag, Peter
1970 The Decline of the Wasp. New York: Touchstone.

Sklare, Marshall
1955 Conservative Judaism. Glencove: Free Press.

Tavuchis, Nicolos
1972 Family and Mobility Among Second Generation Greek-Americans. Athens: National Centre of Social Research.

Theodoratus, Robert
1961 The Influence of Homeland on the Social Organization of a Greek Community in America. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. The University of Washington.

Tomasi, Silvano M. and Madeline H. Engle
1970 The Italian Experience in the United States. Staten Island, N.Y.: Center for Migration Studies.

Tomasi, Lydio
1973 The Ethnic Factor in the Future of Inequality. New York: Center for Migration Studies.

Vlachos, Evangelos C.
1968 The Assimilation of Greeks in the United States. Athens: National Centre of Social Research.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Leo Srole
1945 The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wirth, Lewis
1945 The Problem of Minority Groups. In Ralph Linton, Ed. The Science of Man in the World Crisis. New York: Columbia University Press.

Yannopoulos, George
1972 Workers and Peasants Under the Military Dictatorship. In Greece Under Military Rule. New York: Basic Books Inc.

Yeracaris, Constantine
1950 A Study of the Voluntary Associations of the Greek Immigrants of Chicago from 1890 to 1948 with Special Emphasis on World War I and the Post-war Period. Unpublished MA thesis. The University of Chicago.

PERIODICALS CITED

The Washington Post: December 17, 1904

The Globe: November 10, 1907

The New York Times: June 7, 1917; October 16, 1917; January 6, 1968; January 7, 1968; January 13, 1969.

The Greek Star: August, 1940

The Orthodox Observer: December 17, 1942; April 4, 1973

Time Magazine: February 19, 1973

REPORTS CITED

Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Emigration, 1908-1917. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Annual Report of Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1940. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America. Tenth Biennial Congress of Clergymen and Laity, 1950.

Greek Archdiocese of North and South America. Yearbook, 1964. New York: Published by the Archdiocese.

Greece - Staff Report, February, 1971. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

Labor Conditions in Greece - Monthly Labor Review, August, 1943. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

The Needs of the Growing Greek-American Community in the City of New York. A study prepared for the City of New York by the staff of Hellenic American Neighborhood Action Committee, funded by the Human Resources Administration, 1973.