

emotional outpouring spoke freely about their ordeal and shared their memories with their fellow Armenians. They gave interviews and participated in oral history projects, hoping the world would lend a sympathetic ear to their pain and to the predicament of the nation.

In contrast to the eagerness of some survivors to share the memory of their ordeal, there were many who chose not to speak at all. The reasons for this forced or self-imposed silence varied from one subject to another, but were always regulated by a complex psychological disposition and were revealed by multifaceted modes of behavior. The reason could have been an inexplicable sense of reproach for having survived while other members of the family met a torturous death. It could have been an inner compulsion to leave everything behind and adapt to the new environment: to be integrated into the mainstream like everyone else. There might have been, perhaps, the fear that if they told their stories, they would be set apart from mainstream society – which was especially true in the European and North American communities where prejudice and discrimination against the newcomers was the prevailing reality. It could have been a subconscious effort to spare their children in order to protect them against the paralyzing memory with which they had to live. In many cases, paradoxically, even if they tried to tell their story and set their soul free, they were silenced by their children who were tired of hearing old stories, tired of their parents' impenetrable gloomy mood, their sighs and tears. Or, it could have been an amalgamation of all these factors. A masterful psychoanalytical survey on a vast field could lead to the understanding of the inner world of the survivor in different