living in Turkey. Nostalgic reminiscences had lost meaning for them, pathetic patriotism was not acceptable. How was the memory of their ancestors' ordeal passed on to them? Did they read literary or historical works on the Genocide? Did they lend a receptive ear to their parents' stories? Or did they resent their parents' peculiarity, turn a deaf ear, and silence their urge to ease the burden of memory by speaking out and telling their painful stories?

From my observations, I can say that the second-generation survivors to a large extent served as silent transmitters, in some cases passively, in other cases reluctantly serving as a bridge between their parents and the next generation. The Armenian communities of the Middle East, where the fires of Armenianness were kept burning and instilled into the souls of the young, were notable exceptions. The burden of survival consumed them too, as they fought to get ahead and prove themselves against the "failure" of their parents and against the prevailing prejudice. The question arises: what was the nature of the Armenianness they adhered to? In an atmosphere of prejudice and discrimination, facing the daily struggle to survive and succeed in the world, how much of the ethnic affinity was allowed to go to work in the making of their identity? Literary works of the period reveal that even if the second generation was shut out, or shut itself out, of its parents' traumatic past, the psychological effects of that past imprinted on their parents were absorbed through the father's bitter silence, or the mother's sighs and unhappy disposition. It is certainly true that no matter how deeply the survivors kept the secret of their past, no matter how hard they tried to create a healthy and happy environment, free of