

Second-generation writers seek deliverance from the inherited burden of the past. How best to examine and explain this quest? What categories will be useful in this study to provide a clear picture of the truth about the impact of the Genocide on generations of survivors?

An attempt to categorize the responses

My approach to the typification and categorization of the literary responses of first-generation survivor writers in my previous monograph was based on the authors' predicament and disposition in the aftermath of the Genocide, as well as the themes they entertained in their work and the genres in which they chose to work. Mapping the second-generation responses is more complicated. In the first place, they depend on societal perceptions of Armenian survivors in the New World. Are they treated as refugees? Newcomers? A minority/ethnic group? From the point of view of the survivors themselves, how much cultural influence have they absorbed, in other words, what is the degree of their acculturation/integration and adaptation to the norms and exigencies of the host country? These questions probe the overall symbiotic relationship between the survivor and the mainstream society.

While taking into consideration the role of such external factors in the lives of survivors and in the family atmosphere they provide for their children, it is important to also highlight the parent-child relationship as an instrumental factor in determining the process of transmission of the trauma. Curiously, it is this relationship that for the most part shapes the children's perception of the past and affects the interpretive processes they apply to their experience as