

Cultural Remodelling of Refugee Armenians after the Genocide

*Shushanik Paronyan
Yerevan State University*

Abstract

The present article concerns one of the most painful pages in Armenian history – the Genocide of Armenians in 1915 and its traumatic and tragic outcome – forced migrations and cultural remodelling of ethnic Armenians, those who were able to survive the terrible massacre. The aim of the paper is to discuss how the deported ethnic Western Armenians and their descendants underwent the process of acculturation in the USA, reshaping their ethnic cultural blueprint into Diasporan Armenian cultural tradition. To illustrate cases of cultural remodelling, samples of fictional discourse where the literary heroes present three generations of American Armenians have been examined. The research combines the interpretative frameworks of cross-cultural pragmatics and discourse analysis. The analysis of discourse from cultural perspective allows us to conclude that Diasporan Armenians must have formed a multicultural stratum in the American ethnic patchwork.

Key words: cross-cultural pragmatics, discourse analysis, cultural remodelling, cultural adaptation, multiculturalism.

Introduction

There is no doubt that the harsh and brutal policy of the Turkish government against ethnic Armenians living in Eastern Anatolia or Western Armenia formed the historical basis for reshaping Armenian identity and creating a new cultural type of Armenians – Diasporan Armenians at the rise of the 20th century¹. These are people of Armenian descent who were born and live outside Armenia but display evidence of Armenian national identity. No doubt the influence of Armenian cultural background distinguishes the intellectual and spiritual nature of Diasporan Armenians from the locals. The Western Armenians were deprived of their motherland and forced to migration as a result of the mass deportation and annihilation policy of the Turkish government which began in the 1890s – before World War I. It is well known that the executions of Armenians in 1894-1896 headed by Sultan Abdul-Hamid II came down in history as the hamidian massacres. They were followed by another series of large-scale massacres in April 1909, the so-called Adana or Cilician massacres, after the Young Turks took power of the Ottoman Empire. Thousands of Armenians, “infidels” or

“gyaurs”, as the Turks called the Christians living among them, were slaughtered, tortured or deported from their homes. Many villages and towns were set on fire. These violent actions – massacres, provoked the first significant wave or stage of migration among Western Armenians. Having settled down more or less successfully in Europe and Northern America, these Armenian repatriates greatly contributed to the successful repatriation of their refugee compatriots after the 1915 genocide – the second wave of emigration which was more significant. Since the deportations of Armenians and pre-1915 massacres remained unnoticed and were not condemned by the world community, they were followed by an unprecedented large-scale ethnic cleansing, extermination of Armenians – the indigenous population of modern Eastern Turkey. Thus at least 1,5 million Armenians perished in the period between 1890 – 1915 in Western Armenia as a result of the atrocious genocide committed viciously by the Turkish government. As it was mentioned already, the topic of the article is related to the outcome of this inhuman act, barbarous slaughters on national and religious basis, the survivors of which were forced into exile (Hovannisian 1992; Hovannisian 1997; Morgenthau 1918).

In April 1915 hundreds of thousands of Armenians were deported from their home towns and villages to the Syrian desert Der-el-Zor – a hell of a place where most of them died after long sufferings, starvation and exhaustion, or were brutally murdered on the way by Turkish and Kurdish soldiers. Several hundred thousands of survivors of the genocide found refuge in the neighbouring countries – Syria, Lebanon and Eastern Armenia. Eastern Armenia, a poor and non-stable country at the beginning of the 20th century, torn by wars against the Turks, was unable to protect itself. The immense flow of the long-suffering refugees made things still worse. Hence many countries and international organizations such as the Red Cross aided the refugees in Armenia, opening orphanages for the homeless and exhausted refugees. The grave and hopeless situation in Armenia forced the deported Armenians to look for better places of survival outside Armenia proper. Hence a great number of survivors migrated to different countries, stimulating the rise of a new cultural type of Armenians – Diasporan Armenians. Armenians are deeply and truly thankful to many great political and historical figures of the time who aided the suffering Armenians in Turkey and in Eastern Armenia in 1915 and years after it, voiced their protest against the barbaric tortures, executions and mass exterminations of Armenian population, helped the refugees on their migration routes. The world is not without kind and helpful people².

After long roaming in different Asian and European countries, many refugees moved to the USA – a young and prospective country with multinational background, a country which lacked established, fixed cultural norms, values and was open to new ones. Living in a foreign country, Armenians had to undergo a long and painful process of reorganization of their ethnic cultural background. Thus, the present paper focuses on the course of cultural adjustment or reshaping of American Armenians, i.e. the deported Western Armenians and their descendants.

Cultural Identity and Acculturation Process

Interestingly enough, at present you can find people of Armenian descent living in every corner of the world. These are Western Armenians who migrated from place to place in search of favourable living conditions, and their successors – future generations of expatriate Armenians who were born and live in a foreign country. Admittedly, many members of modern Armenian Diaspora who present the generations of 1915 refugee Armenians (as well as children of mixed marriages) cannot be considered as total outsiders in the Armenian cultural context. Though they mostly do not speak Armenian, they have retained a certain amount of Armenian national identity. Many of them still call themselves Armenians, or at least feel so since they have retained collective historical memory, they share certain cultural, spiritual or bottom-of-the-iceberg values which tie them with their original homeland. Hence, analysing the process of acculturation of American Armenians evidenced in fictional discourse, I will try to resolve the painful dilemma whether these people should be considered monocultural or multicultural.

As we know, migration means getting settled down in new territories and involves encountering an environment which is different from what one is used to, often alien and strange: different social structure, different language, different way of life, beliefs, attitudes, moral system, art – what we call culture in general. There exist different interpretations and definitions of culture but, it is usually viewed as a national blueprint, a set of beliefs, values or mental patterns that people in a particular group share, a set of rules that people follow, a set of largely unconscious habits that govern people's behaviour without them fully realizing it. In other words, culture is the stuff that holds some people together and keeps others away.

Hence migration is closely linked with the phenomenon of acculturation of the migrants – adaptation of the inborn qualities to the foreign cultural blueprint. It is well known that the path of this adaptation or adjustment is not always easy and painless, depending on the compatibility between source and target/host cultures, various socio-economic, political, linguistic, psychological factors and, finally, on the individual personal traits and motives of those who have to undergo convergence, merge with a foreign cultural system. Hence if one wants to be a member of a group, to build close relationships with a cultural community, s/he has to find some kind of tool, some glue in order to stick to this group of people, to become an insider, otherwise one will be treated as a foreigner. Let us agree that this is a strong motive for enhancing cultural awareness and Armenian refugees were simply obliged to undergo adaptation or acculturation in order to become respectable citizens of their new settlement, the USA.

People belonging to one culture share common beliefs which form the basis of their bottom-of-the iceberg values and provide rules for making choices in different situations. These values form the attitude toward what is expected, required or forbidden and, naturally, form human behavior, i.e. tip-of-the iceberg values (Peterson 2004). Hence, on the one hand, the behaviour of people belonging to different cultures should

be and is different since their cultural values are different. On the other hand, one's cultural mindset can be reshaped, remodeled to a certain degree by using adjustment techniques. Therefore people of different cultural backgrounds can easily get together by abandoning some traits of source culture and adopting certain values, attitudes, behavioural patterns of the target or host culture.

As to cultural adaptation, two important aspects of this social phenomenon were revealed according to research carried out by culturologists – *socio-cultural* and *psychological* adjustment: “Socio-cultural adjustment includes general adjustment to foreign living conditions; work adjustment to foreign work culture; and interactional adjustment – the extent of socializing and getting along with those from another culture. Psychological adjustment refers to a person's general mental well-being when immersed in another culture” (Ang 2011:591).

Having in mind S. Ang's definition cited above, I assume that after moving to foreign countries, Armenian emigrants had to fit into a foreign landscape, to adapt to host cultures. Naturally, the refugee Armenians who were exposed to unfamiliar social and natural environment had to lead a new life. They had lost everything: their close relatives, their home towns and villages, their houses, their property, possessions – everything, but they had been given one more chance to live: they were survivors. Naturally, as I have already stated above, in order to become rightful members of a new community, they had to undergo the process of acculturation and experience the above mentioned dimensions of cultural adaptation.

Being compelled to remodel their cultural mindset, Armenian expatriates became vulnerable to estrangement from their natural blueprint, which, I may say, is both distressingly sad and sadly natural. Anyhow, they realized the threat of assimilation and tended to maintain their national identity and cultural background as much as possible. The struggle for remaining Armenian, for retaining the core Armenian values and beliefs engraved in their mind, fear for total alienation from their roots, anxiety in view of total assimilation with foreign culture has always been a focal point in Armenian Diaspora (Peroomian 2012). Interestingly enough, the process of adjustment of the expatriate Armenians and their descendants to external conditions in their new settlements, which we call today “acculturation”, was viewed by many Armenian intellectuals of the time negatively, they considered this process as assimilation, loss of Armenian national identity. Let us agree with R. Peroomian who remarks that this interpretation was natural for a traumatic nation which was on the verge of being extinguished: “Cut off from the homeland and deprived of collective national existence, Diasporan Armenians struggled to survive and perpetuate themselves as a nation in exile”, writes R. Peroomian (Peroomian 2012:30).

How this complicated process developed, how the expatriate Armenians deported from their homeland conformed to the new reality, mainly in the USA, is of special interest in the article. I will try to unveil one of the dark, unseen sides of the migration

process which concerns cultural adjustment, and, in our case, Americanization of deported Armenians.

Cultural Remodelling of Deported Armenians in the USA

To explore a problem which is so far behind in time, about 100 years or so, is a difficult task. As a cultural insider, I would like to highlight one essential characteristic feature which is highly attributable to Armenian culture: we, Armenians, have a special attachment, respect for words and their product – speech, discourse, whether written or oral, in verse or in prose. Truly, at present a great number of detailed factual information, statistics, data and undeniable documented evidence of the Armenian Genocide is available. Numerous historical surveys, memoirs, eyewitness accounts of the extermination and exile of Armenians in Western Armenia have been published in many languages. Much has been written about Armenian Diaspora, about the sad life story of Armenian emigrants roaming around the world. Both the achievements and frustrations of expatriate Armenians and their descendants have been described in numerous documentary and fictional publications (Arlen 1975; Bedoukian 1979; Hartunian 1999; Kouynjian 1985; Balakian 2003).

Commenting on Armenian Genocide Literature, R. Peroomian remarks: “There is an undeniable truth in the power and intensity of the impact that a literary representation of genocide can make and the crucial role it can play” (Peroomian 2012:5). It should be stated that Armenian Genocide Literature underwent several stages of development. Early literary works devoted to the topic of Genocide presented pieces of artistic literature written mainly in Armenian, Western Armenian, more precisely. In these literary works the first-generation survivor-writers of the hamidian massacres and 1915 slaughters described the horrors of the Genocide, presented the grim and unhappy situation of the deported Armenians and indicated effective ways of escaping assimilation with foreign culture. Of course, many intellectuals of the time like Levon Shant, a first-generation Genocide writer, saw the vulnerability of the Western Armenian refugees and realized that influences of the culture of the host country were inevitable – otherwise the ethnic group would be isolated from the host community and become a cultural outsider (Peroomian 2012).

Since we, Armenians, are not only writers but great readers as well, this kind of literature played a great role in the life of Armenian Diaspora. Quite rightly, it was regarded as a means of preserving the collective, historical memory and the national identity of emigrant Armenians.

The second stage of Armenian Genocide Literature, as stated by R. Peroomian, is presented by the writings of the younger generation, the so-called “orphans of the desert”, writers who were born in Western Armenia, survived the genocide and began their adult life in Diaspora (Peroomian 2012). No matter how much the pained and disturbed Armenian writers tried to write their bitter life story, to inform the world about the sufferings of a whole nation, these writings were mainly of local interest: they

remained mostly unnoticed since they were written by cultural outsiders whose worldview was strange and unfamiliar, who wrote about things the world community in general and the American society in particular were not interested in, and in a manner that did not appeal to the local, that is, American readers.

At this point it is worth mentioning Michael Arlen, a successful American writer of the 1930s. In order to “fit in” with the literary life in England in the 1920s and gain success, the young talented writer of Armenian descent, Dikran Kouyoumjian, had to eliminate the features of his Armenian identity which caused a lot of trouble for his career as a writer. His first book, “The London Venture”, published when he was 24, was a collection of London sketches, written in first person. This book was about a young Armenian (the narrator), called Dikran, who was trying to make his living in London. The book was hardly “noticed” by critics and readers (Arlen 1970). Those who read it, thought it was written either by T. Moore or A. Bennett – a remark which is not a compliment for a writer: to copy the style of another writer, even a famous one, is not encouraged in the literary world. And when D. Kouyoumjian’s publisher advised him to change his name, he was fully pleased to do so. Thus he took the pseudonym Michael Arlen and essentially erased his Armenian heritage, moreover, he changed his topic, stopped writing about Armenians and changed his style. Success came to him when he wrote a romantic and modern novel – “The Green Hat” and after that came crime fiction – mystery and horror stories.

There is no doubt that Armenian Genocide Literature played a prominent and key role in the life of the deported Armenians who were shocked by the indifference of the world community and social injustice. Quoting R. Peroomian, “Diasporan literature as well as the Armenian press, especially in the Western world, did not aim to accelerate the process of acculturation and adaptation of the new Armenian settlers. On the contrary, it strengthened their bonds with the lost homeland and the memory of the traumatic past” (Peroomian 2012:37). Hence in the early life of Armenian Diaspora, attachment to the past was an effective strategy used to perpetuate the spirit of belonging to Armenian heritage and strengthening the emotional side of being an Armenian. R. Peroomian writes further, “Articles frankly promoting nationalism and adherence to Armenian values, the past, and the image of a non-existent homeland could not be as effective as artistic literature indirectly and subtly communicating these ideas” (Peroomian 2012:42).

As I mentioned, the early Armenian Genocide Literature, that is the documentary, historical and literary works, which were published promptly after the genocide and some 20-30 years after it, was written in Armenian and had a limited audience – a generation of deported Armenians who read and spoke Armenian. Sadly enough, their children and grandchildren did not. Consequently, there appeared a need for cross-cultural communication – dissemination of Armenian cultural values to English-speaking generations of American Armenians, many of whom came from mixed marriages and were losing ties with their origins. The new trend in Diasporan literature

appeared in the late 1930s, when the first-generation Armenian American writers – the first generation born in America, whose language was English, took to writing. This generation of Armenians had not witnessed the horrors of the Genocide, they had endured its effects only. As a matter of fact, many of them did not know much about the unspeakable atrocities of the massacre since their elders – parents, grandparents – did not want to frustrate their descendants with stories full of horror, they wanted to raise a generation free from stress, a generation free from the feeling of being a victimized nation. The older generation realized that in order to adapt to the new environment their descendants should not carry the heavy burden of Genocide memories the way they did, they should not feel like morally oppressed minorities. So, to save their children's souls, they kept this part of their biography in dark. Interestingly enough, in most cases it was grandparents who tried to preserve cultural ties with Armenia: they told their grandchildren about their historical past, taught them Armenian words, sang Armenian songs, told tales and recited poems. There is an interesting story about the famous writer Michael Arlen Senior whom many Armenians of his time and later "accused of" having betrayed his nation. M. Arlen visited his son in a boarding school in Paris with a box of chocolates in his hand. The son, the future writer Michael Arlen Jr., about whom I'm going to speak again a bit later, ran up to him very joyfully and shouted: "Papa, my teacher said I am Armenian!". The father's heart sank, his face was distorted to hear this, because he had hidden from his son his nationality. Later M. Arlen Jr. wrote that he hated his father for depriving him of his national identity and exposing to European values (Gasparyan 2014).

Thus the third stage of Armenian Genocide Literature is presented by literary works of first-generation Armenian American writers. These authors were born in the USA, their first language was English and, naturally, they created their works in English. Interestingly enough, these writings concern the problem of the genocide, discuss the horrible experience of the previous generation of Armenians, but they mostly do not tend to propagate openly the necessity of preserving the Armenian cultural identity unchanged, the need for following age-old Armenian customs and traditions, keeping Armenian values. Naturally, these pieces of artistic literature are created by writers of Armenian heritage who have undergone the process of adaptation and hence their writings reflect this complicated process of cultural transformation. Actually, in literary studies carried out so far, little has been said about the difficulties in the process of acculturation of Armenians or the process of Americanization itself. Hence I assume that the analysis of these literary works from the perspective of cross-cultural pragmatics may reveal the gradual process of remodelling Armenian national identity and creating a new cultural subgroup – Diasporan Armenian (Paronyan 2011; Paronyan, Rostomyan 2011; Paronyan, Bekaryan 2013)

Literature as a Cultural Tool

As I said, the literary works by first-generation Armenian American writers did not necessarily touch the Armenian topic. They wrote about their experience and feelings in the new environment which was home for them, not a foreign country. Of course they could not escape the topic of their Armenian identity entirely. Some of them wrote down the sad stories describing the horrors of the genocide told by the older generation, that is their grandparents, from memory, others took information from documentary and historical books. “Many talented American Armenians found writing to be their salvation in their struggle for dignity, identity, and meaning, while creating a niche for themselves in this country that their parents called the Diaspora, but for them was home”, writes D. Kherdian (Kherdian 2007:xi).

Even now, the succeeding generations of Armenians pursue this line – they explore the roots of their identity, trying to unveil who they are, where they come from, why they differ in their core values from most Americans.

The writings produced by first-generation Armenian American writers are full of descriptions of their ancestors’ early life conditions and survival in foreign environment, and therefore, they can throw light on the issue under question – the process of acculturation of Armenian expatriates. The spontaneity and gradualness of this process can best be traced in these works since they usually touch upon the lives of three generations: grandparents born in Western Armenia, parents, uncles, aunts who were born in Western Armenia but emigrated in their early childhood or youth, and the third generation – young Armenian Americans who were born in a foreign country which became their birthplace.

Thus, what I suggest here is using cultural spectacles when interpreting a work of fiction. The suggested method will help us reveal certain implicit information encoded by an ethnic Armenian writer which may be veiled from the view of a cultural outsider. My survey is based on a special type of fiction – autobiographic novels and stories. This kind of artistic literature takes a special, medial position among the genres of creative prose writings, since it is neither memoir, nor fictitious narrative – fiction.

For the purpose of analysis I have chosen two autobiographic novels written by first-generation Armenian American writers: “Exiles” by M.J. Arlen, “The Gate” by Peter Sourian, and a collection of autobiographic short stories by W. Saroyan “My Name is Aram”. So, my idea is that, by reading these autobiographical works through cultural spectacles and comparing the lifestyles of the representatives of three generations as described by the protagonists, we will be able to reveal the process of gradual remodelling of Armenian cultural identity.

In fact, the first generation of expatriate Armenians, that is the older generation – grandmothers and grandfathers – hardly knew English. Many of them did not learn

proper English since they did not need it: they lived mostly separated from the society, in a kind of closed communities, continued their usual way of life, ate the food they were used to eating, kept in touch with their countrymen solely. This kind of atmosphere, we will see, is described by W. Saroyan in his short stories. Thus the old did not need external links for communication, and, as a result, they did not feel deprived, discriminated in American community. Hence, on the basis of cultural reading, we can assume that the first generation of expatriate Armenians living in the USA had mono-cultural background and displayed features of total cultural outsiders: the USA was neither their native country nor home country.

The second or younger generation, that is the children, teenagers, youngsters who migrated to the USA, necessarily learned English and became more or less bilingual: they spoke Armenian at home but had to maintain social ties in English. Some of them spoke English worse than Armenian, of course, but anyhow, many Armenian expatriates got educated and integrated successfully in the American community, obtained full social status of American citizens. We see them working in different positions, networking successfully in their social environment. Some of them even married foreigners, which, naturally, boosted the process of integration with the host culture. Needless to say, these mixed marriages presented quite a new generation of Armenian identity. Thus we can assume on the basis of our cultural reading that in the course of time the second generation of Armenian expatriates living in the USA were gradually becoming multicultural, they displayed features of partial cultural outsiders: the USA became their native country but not home country – the country they come from and feel they belong to.

And lastly, the third generation comprises young men and women, descendants from Armenian families and mixed marriages born in America. This generation American Armenians gladly absorbed the new values of the USA which was their native country. No doubt they were cultural insiders since they were born and got education in this country, spoke English, shared common beliefs, values with the other members of the society. Anyhow, our cultural reading makes us believe that they had some incompatibility with the social environment, a certain kind of difference in lifestyle, values and mindset which they sought to find out. I think perhaps this is because they had traces of collective historical and emotional memory in the subconscious which tied them invisibly with their home country and original cultural background – Western Armenia. Therefore, this generation of American Armenians are not total outsiders from the point of view of Armenian cultural context and should be considered multicultural.

When writing, describing certain events, creating a literary hero, the writer subconsciously encodes certain information which is intended for a special kind of reader. This information can be revealed by applying the method of cross-cultural

pragmatic analysis on a work of fiction. Thus reading culturally will help us reveal certain implicit motives of the ethnic Armenian author which may remain unnoticed by an unprepared reader, a reader who does not share certain cultural background. I am sure that autobiographic literary works have already been analysed by many literary critics, but in our case the study of discourse from the cultural perspective will help us unveil the long process of ethnic identity deformation or, to put it mildly, the process of cultural remodelling or forming multiculturalism, as we call it in the era of globalisation.

Revealing Changes in Cultural Factors through Discourse Analysis

What is common for the three literary works chosen for cross-cultural pragmatic analysis? First of all the composition of narration which includes the life story of the above mentioned three generations. Secondly, the technique of narration. Both M. Arlen and P. Sourian trace their family story by employing a narration technique which I propose to call polychronic writing. The narration of the novels contains a sort of independent and seemingly incohesive passages of memories from the past and present events following one another. Hence the plot of the novels constantly “jumps” forward and backward, bringing back memories from the past and returning to the present events.

The story of three generations of the Stepanyan family is narrated by P. Sourian in the novel “The Gate”. The plot of the autobiographic novel, written from the name of the third generation representative of the family Paul Stepanyan, evolves by using the technique of brief interrupted narrations, different topics alternating with one another in a kind of narrative jump – jumps from stories of escape and deportation from Western Armenia to Peter Stepanyan’s settlement in Boston, his career and, further on, to present events – the life of the writer Paul Stepanyan and his sister Grace in their birthplace, the USA.

In his autobiographic novel “Exiles”, Michael J. Arlen recalls events from the life of his extended family, three generations of Armenians: his grandparents, his parents and their siblings, his own and his sister’s. He uses the same literary technique by shifting the narration from current events in the lives of his heroes to pages from their past and vice versa. He begins recalling some old facts in the form of memory, and after that the narrative comes back to present times again. This style creates the effect of flash-news, but most importantly, the author involuntarily or subconsciously presents the diachronic life picture of the literary heroes which enables us to define the level of their acculturation at different periods of time. In fact, the author describes life events which clearly show the problems the Armenian emigrants had in the process of cultural adaptation.

In W. Saroyan’s stories the narration technique is different but the genre is similar – autobiographical. The author tells the story of his life from the name of a fictional

character, Aram Garoghlyan, who is a third generation representative of an extended Armenian expatriate family. This is a true story of Armenian emigrants who appeared in a foreign land and had to make their way to adapt in a new environment.

There is another fact which is common in all the writings – the representatives of the older generation have one and the same dream: they dream of returning home, to the old country, “*ergir*” in Armenian, one day. Maybe they know that this is a myth, but they do believe it. They refuse to adopt elements of foreign culture and keep to their old traditions: they remain faithful to Armenian Apostolic church and baptize their children, dress the way they did in their old country, preserve traditional moral values, cook Armenian dishes, drink traditional alcoholic drink – *rakhi*, play traditional board and card games – *tavli* or *tahlvoo*, scambile. Our cultural spectacles help us reveal an important characteristic feature which is common to all characters of the first generation: this is sadness. They are all sad, grieving people, nervous and shouting at others most of the time. When in the story “The Summer of the Beautiful White Horse” Aram’s grandfather, angry over a trifle, slammed the door, the grandmother said in his defense: *He is simply homesick* (Saroyan 1941:28).

The beautiful white horse is the dream of the young heroes. Hence the loss of the horse, over which the Assyrian neighbour grieves, seems to be too trivial for deported Armenians as compared with the loss of homeland:

My uncle Khosrove became very irritated and shouted, It's no harm. What is the loss of a horse? Haven't we all lost the homeland? What is this crying over a horse?

(W. Saroyan “My Name is Aram”, p. 27)

The next feature that characterizes the Armenian emigrants is the volume of voice: the representatives of the older generation are reported to be speaking loudly, especially the male ones: they shout and roar. Generally, loud speech is a typical Armenian trait but when the writer describes the literary heroes to be shouting and roaring, it means that he stresses their nervous psychological state of mind. According to P. Sourian, Armenians have guttural voice, they speak gutturally. As it appeared it was one of the Western Armenian dialects, the Van dialect. As a cultural insider I know well that when two Armenians are introduced to each other, they usually ask about their roots – which region of Armenia they are from. Armenians are very sensitive about local varieties, because they have certain structured stereotypes for different regions. A cultural outsider may not know this and may fail to notice that the author does not like people who come from Van and describes speakers of this dialect negatively. He does not mention the name of the Armenian boy who helped Sarkis on his first days of arrival and calls him scornfully “the boy from Van”. In another situation he again criticizes, finds fault with “*vanetsis*” (people from Van) who, he says, are always having some meetings.

Furthermore, when speaking English, the Armenian emigrants insert certain Armenian elements in their speech. They use Armenian interjections, e.g. *akh* to describe pain, *ahman*, to express surprise, *ouf*, to express anger; they use Armenian proverbs and sayings translated into English: *If you're an ass you're bound to be ridden* (Sourian 1965:50), *Don't pull the devil's tail* (Sourian 1965:120), *The man has a face made of leather – the sole of a shoe* (Sourian 1965:247), *Not all Armenians are sheep* (Sourian 1965:183). It is generally known that cowardice in Armenian culture is seen as being sheepish, that is shamefaced, timid. Therefore, if one is compared with a sheep, he is considered to be a coward.

Armenian expatriates often use code-switching, especially the younger ones, who do not know English well but want to sound stylish, to make an impression on others. For example, they speak Armenian, then they insert *ok* in English, or address somebody by calling them *buddy*.

The boy from Van asked Sarkis: "Do you play cards?" "Yes." "O.K. Come on," the boy said, taking Sarkis along by the arm. "What's O.K.?" "That's American. It means all right. We say it in the middle of talking Armenian," the boy said, laughing. "I say, Oh, sure, too."

(P. Sourian "The Gate", p. 39)

Hence I assume that these elements indicate some changes in the speech of the Armenian emigrants and reflect the first step of acculturation.

The first thing that shocks the cultural reader in the above mentioned literary works is the fact of ethnic discrimination: the way the heroes feel in their new settlement, the way they are treated by Americans. The description of the inner feelings of the first and second generation literary heroes makes us believe that they realized the unfair attitude towards them, they were aware of the fact that they differed from others and carried the label "foreigner". This fact has become so trivial, and natural for the emigrant Armenians that when M.J. Arlen describes his father's appearance in his novel, he involuntarily externalizes this subconscious idea:

He was young, slight, short, foreign-looking man, dark hair, long nose, dark face – and intelligent, talkative, nery, and desirous to please in that endearing and awful way of certain foreigners in a strange court.

(M. Arlen "Exiles", p. 69)

Furthermore, M.J. Arlen writes that his father, a famous writer and journalist who lived in England and worked for this country, was not expected to show any patriotic display of emotions to this country during World War II because he was a foreigner. It was so humiliating that M.S. Arlen moved to the USA shortly after. I was pretty surprised when I read what D.H. Lawrence, whom M. Arlen considered as a close friend

and with whom he cooperated a great deal, wrote about him in a letter to Lady Ottoline Morrell: "Kouyoumjian seems a bit blatant and pushing; you may be put off by him. But that is because he is very foreign, even though he doesn't know it himself. In English life he is in a strange, alien medium, and he can't adjust himself. But I find the core of him good" (Calonne 2007:300).

Another disgraceful fact of discrimination can be revealed in M.J. Arlen's description of a party, when they invited some American friends to their place. The author describes the event and innocently notices that when the American guests told a joke, everybody laughed at it, but when his father, Dikran Kouyumjian, added something to this story, nobody paid attention to it, they did not laugh:

Nobody seemed interested in what he said, in him. Everyone nonetheless friendly, or whatever it is that passes for friendliness.

(M. Arlen "Exiles", p. 47)

M. Arlen Senior's feelings about living in London are also described when his son "jumps back" to discuss his first book, "The London Venture", which is about *being Armenian in Anglo-Saxon England*. His feelings of foreignness are disguised, they are mostly hinted, pictured jokingly:

An Armenian in London finds quickly that his nationality is something of a faux-pas [...].

(M. Arlen "Exiles", p. 69)

It is amazing what P. Sourian's young hero, 16-year-old Sarkis did the first when he arrived in Boston by liner: he bought himself a hat in Manhattan, like the ones the passing men wore. No doubt the boy's wish was to disguise himself, to hide the fact of being foreign.

One more discriminatory fact can be picked out from Sarkis's early emigrant life described by P. Sourian. Trying to acculturate in a foreign country by exterminating his ties with his fellow-countrymen, Sarkis went to a school where only Americans studied. We can infer from the author's vivid description of Sarkis's school life that his school mates neglected him and he made friends with a negro, Fabius Philip, who also was neglected by the whites. Thus the deported Armenian boy was discriminated the same way as the negroes were in the USA in those days.

Cultural discourse analysis helps us reveal the feelings of the emigrant Armenians toward host culture, too. Thus we can see that the first and second generation American Armenians, whose acculturation is still under way, treat the locals as "foreigners". For example, during a Christmas party organized by Sarkis, where some Americans were also present, Boghosyan, a literary hero representing the second generation of emigrants, began to make a toast in Armenian. Sarkis, the host, also second generation

representative, told Boghosyan to speak English since there was one American among the guests who did not understand Armenian:

Boghosyan nodded, then turned toward the foreigner and smiled.

(P. Sourian "The Gate" pp. 180-81)

Needless to say, the word "foreigner" describes Boghosyan's feelings at its best: he sees this person's identity different from his own and does not approve of it. This kind of attitude shows the low stage of acculturation of the emigrant. Hence our cultural reading reveals that in the "jumps" of narration where the literary heroes are categorised as Armenians and non-Armenians, the process of acculturation is still under way. These emigrant literary heroes feel and behave like cultural outsiders and, similarly, the locals also see them different from the expected social, behavioural pattern and discriminate them. I would like to note that this kind of discriminatory behaviour is evident in the passages describing the early life of the emigrants, the life of the first and second generation literary heroes.

As for the third generation, these young people know about their family's immigrant past but their spiritual, moral image is different, as it is depicted in the literary works under question. Cultural discourse analysis enables us to conclude that despite some problems which they experience when dealing with the locals, they mainly think and behave like them.

Describing the life of his third generation young hero in the early 1920s, W. Saroyan shows that the American society of that period is not tolerant to the otherness of alien culture – whether Armenian or any other. We can see that Aram Garoglanian is often insulted at school by his teachers for his otherness: for having a strange name that sounds foreign to the teacher's ear and appears to be difficult to read, for having strange habits, for eating food with unpleasant smell and so on. In the story "The Foreigner" the Armenian boy struggles against the label "foreign". He argues with his friends, immigrants themselves, that he is an American.

"I am American," I said. "The hell you are," Hawk said: "Roy's Italian, I'm Syrian, and I guess you're Armenian." "Sure," I said. "I'm Armenian all right, but I'm American, too. I speak better English than I do Armenian."

"I can't talk Syrian at all", Hawk bragged, "but that's what I am. If anybody asks you what you are, for God's sake, don't tell them you're American. Tell them you're Armenian... "If you're Armenian and you say you're American everybody'll laugh at you." "Aren't you American?" "Don't make me laugh," Hawk said. "I'm a foreigner." "Weren't you born in America?" "I was born in Fresno... What does it have to do with it?"

(W. Saroyan "The Foreigner", p. 245)

And then comes a phrase uttered by the young literary hero which illustrates the author's unfavourable attitude to the discriminatory behaviour of the locals in Fresno:

I wished I lived in a more civilized part of the country.

(W. Saroyan "The Foreigner", p. 248)

Needless to say, the generation born in the USA underwent considerable changes and deviated from the Armenian cultural pattern, becoming largely multicultural. Therefore, it is quite amusing to observe how Paul Stepanyan, in his 1961 life event descriptions, acted like a native American and treated new emigrants – Hungarians, Checks the same way as Americans treat foreigners, looking down on them.

Now the most typical problem in the process of acculturation is known to be language. Language is an important medium of culture since it is through language that cultural values and behaviours are learned and expressed. Language plays a great role in forming and expressing identity, ethnic identity in particular.

Since language and culture are closely interconnected, the first disadvantage of the Armenian migrants, the first barrier they met in the process of cultural adjustment was language. Acquiring a foreign language, one subconsciously adopts certain elements of culture which are formulated in the form of written or oral tradition – values, attitudes, historical facts, moral, right and wrong behaviour and so on. Thus having undertaken the task to read the above mentioned works culturally, we can observe the following picture: the process of cultural adaptation of the newly arrived Armenians with their compatriots proceeds very smoothly. This can be explained not only by the fact that they are welcomed, treated warmly as insiders, but also by the fact that they have no problem with communication. Meanwhile their adaptation with outsiders or foreigners is painful, first of all because of cross-cultural communication problems. The analysis of the process of acculturation of refugee Armenians from the point of view of foreign language acquisition reveals the following picture.

The first generation, that is the older characters who represent grandparents, great uncles, aunts are close to the source culture: they do not speak English, or speak with grammar mistakes and foreign accent. They keep close ties with their old countrymen. In fact, most of them do not even need English as they do not socialize with foreigners – Americans. They are proud of being Armenian, they stress it all the time. They call Armenia "the old country" and the US "this country". M. Arlen describes his grandparents as old people in rimless glasses and black clothes who could still barely speak English. Paul Stepanyan's grandma also barely spoke English, neither did Aram Garoglanian's grandparents.

The analysis of Mr. Dorian's letter to his daughter who studied in Europe may reveal some interesting facts about the level of acculturation of the literary hero. The letter, which is written in English, contains serious grammar and spelling mistakes which P. Sourian has not "corrected" for the sake of truthfulness:

I am in dark about your doings and I don't like your so long silence. You must wright at least once in 2 weeks. It is absolutely nessecery and tell us about your doings in school life and what you are learning.

(P. Sourian "The Gate", p. 52)

Mr. Dorian's letter is surely an example of Armenian mindset and presents pragmlinguistic features of low context culture. The passage of discourse under question contains direct speech acts, order, question and instruction, which perform a face-threatening communicative strategy and indicate the status and power of the writer, his right to inflict his will, his opinion on the addressee. In low context Armenian culture the father is usually empowered to urge a certain kind of action on his children by expressing his directions explicitly, via direct speech acts. As we know, in high context cultures like American culture, indirect speech acts which veil any kind of imposition are preferred. Hence we can conclude that though Mr. Dorian acquired certain language skills in English, his mind operated within the frames of Armenian cultural values.

Now our observation shows that the second generation, many of whom were born in emigration, or at least were very young when they were exiled, speaks both Armenian and English. These characters – uncles, aunts, speak English with a foreign accent which the authors often mock. In the story "The Fifty-Yard Dash" Saroyan shows the pronunciation of his uncle Gyko via spelling: *mohney, heem, weasdom: I wheel break hease haed fooling all you leattle keads seacret. He ease a liar* (Saroyan 1941).

We can conclude that the representatives of the second generation display evident traces of acculturation. This group of emigrants consider themselves Americans and want to be considered as Americans by others. They speak Armenian but, at the same time, try to adopt as much as possible from target culture. They understand that in order to adjust to American culture, they have to learn English. Hence we see them studying at school, at college, trying to make their way in the society. Very often we can see that they nag their parents for not adopting American culture, or criticize them because they do not want to speak English. *My father would sometimes get impatient with her (he, the youngest child), chide her for not speaking English better, for not wanting to, for hiding behind her foreignness*, writes M. Arlen (1970:88).

The second generation Armenian expatriates gladly make acquaintances with Americans and adopt their traditions. For example, the authors state that they celebrate Christmas, Halloween and other holidays, something that the old generation did not do. Many of them do not teach their children Armenian and even do not allow them to speak Armenian.

As I said at the beginning of the article, the process of acculturation was and continues to be interpreted ambiguously by Armenian community up to present days. Some Armenians see only the negative sides of this process, treating it as assimilation, betrayal, others treat it positively, as flexibility and ability to survive. The conflict of

these two viewpoints can also be revealed via cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of discourse. Hence the fact of cultural adjustment, forging of ethnic Armenian identity, rejection of Armenian values often forms the basis for conflict between refugee Armenians. For example, Ed. Serjian and S. Stepanyan dislike Boghosyan because he is “real old-country type” and rejects any kind of adjustment with American culture, a fact which is interpreted by them negatively (Sourian 1965:304).

Sarkis comes to the USA with a firm decision to succeed in life and soon he realizes that the main obstacle is his inability to speak English. He lives among Armenian emigrants, lives in an Armenian family and speaks mainly Armenian. He realizes that in order to succeed he has to learn English, to make friends, acquaintances with Americans. Thus he goes to college and does his best to study English, goes to live in an American family in order to practice speaking English. He plays games with his American peers, does what they do. *He would have to force himself away from speaking Armenian*, writes P. Sourian (1965:61) about Sarkis. As the process of remodeling Sarkis’s cultural background proceeds, we read the author’s comment that Sarkis even *thought in English*. This fact, of course, shows an advanced level of acculturation which Sarkis achieved due to his tremendous effort. Later he married the daughter of an Armenian businessman who hosted him on his arrival in Boston – Nevart Dorian. They had two children, a son and a daughter whom they gave foreign names – Paul and Grace. In his frantic efforts to achieve success in a foreign country, Sarkis went to the opposite extreme, denying the Armenian language and culture. He did not allow his mother-in-law to teach his children Armenian, for which the old woman hated him and taught her grandchildren Armenian words secretly. He organized parties, celebrated Christmas, invited American people to his place. The reader might think that the author deliberately wants Sarkis’s character to be evaluated negatively: Sarkis denies his Armenian identity, imposes American values on his family members. As it is, he could be treated as a kind of Judas, an example of a “traitor” of Armenianness. Anyhow, looking at this character from the point of view of a cultural reader, I, personally, would not blame Sarkis for his love of Yankees, for losing his Armenian identity. After all, this painful choice was inflicted on him by his harsh life conditions. In reality, I think P. Sourian does not aim to show only the negative sides of Sarkis’s character, he somehow tries to justify his literary hero’s frantic desire to suppress his Armenian identity in a foreign culture. Thus we can see that Sarkis is not devoid of any pro-Armenian ideology: *I am crazy enough to be more Armenian than any one of them*, he speculates (Sourian 1965:304). He reads Armenian newspapers and is interested in the problems of Armenians, he hates Turks and, moreover, agrees to design an Armenian church in New York. All these facts make us believe that despite certain visible traces of cultural remodeling, certain core Armenian values have remained intact in the representatives of the second generation American Armenians.

In the novel “Exiles”, D. Kouyumjian, or M. Arlen Senior was also a representative of the second generation Armenians who chose to remodel their cultural blueprint and

change entirely the national identity of the children. The cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of M. Arlen Senior's son's discourse (that is the above mentioned autobiographical novel written by the son) comes to prove that the father failed to achieve his goal. Trying to explore his Armenian roots, tracing out and interpreting certain facts of early family life, evaluating the echo of the past events on his present life, M.J. Arlen subconsciously displays elements of Armenian culture. His writing makes evident the presence of core Armenian values in his mind: exceptional love for one's homeland, religion and language, deep respect for one's parents and elders.

As for the third generation pictured in the literary works, we observe that while the grandparents, aunts and uncles grieve for the old country, try to preserve their national identity unimpaired, the younger characters, the generation born in the USA of Armenian parents, gladly adopt American culture, values and try to respect them. As we have stated earlier, the generation born in the USA also underwent certain humiliation. Nevertheless, our cultural spectacles help us reveal that they are more acculturated, more adapted to their new environment than their parents and grandparents. M.J. Arlen describes how he and his sister wanted to Americanize themselves, acquiring baseball mitts and bobby-sox. Their names are mostly foreign – Paul, Grace, Michael, etc. They speak English fluently, so when the grandfather in Saroyan's story "My Cousin Dikran, the Orator" asked his grandson to tell him what he had learned at school, the boy said: *I can't tell you in Armenian* (Saroyan 1941:138).

Anyhow, reading the cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of the discourse enables us to conclude that the third generation American Armenians have preserved a great deal of Armenian national identity. Truly enough, many of them do not speak Armenian, they have married foreigners, they speak English to their children and teach them American values and morals. Anyhow, our analysis reveals that despite evident Americanization, they have retained certain core Armenian values. Thus when Paul takes off his clothes, in his mind the Armenian words taught by his grandmother come to him: "goshik", "kulpa". His grandmother's image is associated with his ancestral past, his Armenian roots which still survive in his mind. The cross-cultural pragmatic interpretation of the author's description speaks of the third generation literary hero's subconscious adherence to his ancestral cultural values – homeland, language, parenthood.

We all know that despite being physiologically identical, human beings display great variety in terms of physical appearance, psychological traits, social structure, language and so on. Hence there exist several principles of classification of mankind, based on certain characteristic features such as race, nationality, country, religion, sex and sexual orientation, profession and so on. Recently it has become common to classify groups of people according to culture as well. The basis for this kind of classification is the assumption that nations display differences or similarities across certain cultural dimensions (Samovar, Porter, McDaniel 2012).

The cultural aspect of human life has long been in the focus of different scholars and developed in a special field of studies – culture studies, cultural anthropology,

culturology and so on. The scholars study various aspects of culture and draw conclusions by defining certain dimensions according to which different cultures can be measured, estimated and compared. These dimensions form cultural patterns on the basis of which cultures are classified. Hence I would like to dwell on another aspect of cultural adaptation which concerns conceptual dimensions developed by G. Hofstede³.

In my analysis I will touch upon the cultural dimension collectivism/individualism which has to do with relationships among people and is related to the degree to which people in a society are integrated into groups. According to research carried out by G. Hofstede, US culture is highly individualistic, which means that in this country the individual is the most important unit in any social setting, independence is stressed, individual achievement is awarded (Hofstede 2012). Contrary to this, Armenians, specifically Western Armenian emigrants, belonged to collectivistic culture, which means that they had notable concern with relationships. This fact is best seen in the writings under question, when we compare the acculturation level of the three generations across time after their arrival in emigration. As the authors describe the lifestyle of their heroes, we reveal that the newly arrived Armenians usually form a kind of tribal unit, colony if you like and strictly differentiate between insiders and outsiders: Armenians/non-Armenians. The Armenian emigrants whose degree of acculturation is low mostly rely on their in-groups (e.g. relatives, compatriots) to look after them and in exchange they believe they owe loyalty to the group. They try to get hold of one another, take care of the newcomers. When young S. Stepanyan arrived in Boston, he was met by his father's old friend Boghosyan. The latter introduced Sarkis to the community of Armenian emigrants who accepted him gladly, treated him like an in-group member, provided him with accommodation, food and work. The way the members of the host Armenian family, people absolutely strange to him, treated him is amazing – they fed him, took care of him when he was ill. Similarly, when he went to college, he was gladly hosted by his friend's family. Thus we can observe that at the early stage of acculturation emigrant Armenians, people absolutely unfamiliar to each other but tied through national identity, lived in a kind of extended family, keeping close ties with each other as in-groups do in a collectivistic culture.

In M. Arlen's novel there are passages where he recalls the extended family gatherings with his grandparents, his uncles and their children, describes their warm attitude and affection towards each other. The author's artless observations concerning the relationship between the family members make us believe that they belonged to collectivistic culture.

In W. Saroyan's collection of stories the collectivistic nature of Armenian culture is quite evident for a cultural reader. The Garoghlanians, ruled by the oldest member of the extended family, the grandfather, had a lot of uncles, cousins, nephews. The literary heroes of the stories are young Aram's relatives whom he calls proudly *my cousin Dikran, my uncle Giko, my cousin Mourad, my uncle Melik, my uncle Khosrove*, etc.

Pronunciation of old-country names is a matter of being proud, writes W. Saroyan (Saroyan 1941:123).

An amazing fact indicating the collectivistic nature of Armenian culture is described by W. Saroyan in his story "The Poor and Burning Arab". In this story Aram's uncle Khosrove, his mother's brother, makes friends with a foreigner, an Arab, because he sees similarity between him and the man – the latter has also been out of his country which he misses. What is interesting, uncle Khosrove frequently hosts his Arab friend not in his own, but in his sister's house where they play tavli, drink coffee and chat. Uncle Khosrove, a sad, loud-speaking and ill-tempered Armenian emigrant often shouts at his sister's son Aram as if he were scolding and bringing up his own child. Strangely, Aram does not feel hurt at all, at least W. Saroyan does not write anything about Aram's negative interpretation or emotions: it seems quite natural for him that his uncle should receive his guest at his sister's house and shout at her son.

Thus, since American and Armenian cultures were opposite in terms of the above mentioned cultural dimension (American culture was individualistic while Armenian culture was collectivistic), we can conclude that when getting adapted to American lifestyle, Armenian emigrants had to remodel their cultural mindset in this dimension as well. Now I think the above mentioned dimensions have deep roots in the mindset of the nation, they belong to core beliefs and certain cognitive tunings which have collective significance. Therefore, the reshaping of the collectivistic nature of the American Armenians was a long process and it may not have been completed even now, in the minds of the descendants of 1915 genocide refugee Armenians. As it is, according to my observations, the second generation pictured in the writings does not show any serious transformations in this sphere. These characters, as described by the authors, obviously display collectivistic group relationships, especially towards their compatriots.

As for the generation born in the USA, my cultural observations make me think that they are more individualistic in their views. Judging by the interpretation of the authors, the young American Armenians have adopted a certain amount of individualistic features: they do not expect any kind of preaching or instruction from their parents, they have their own moral system and make love with foreigners without marrying them, they do not rely on in-groups only but try to be more independent. They need more privacy, voice their opinion and do not depend on the elders' opinion. As a result we can conclude that their ties with Armenians have become weaker.

In M. Arlen's narration I have noted a piece of discourse which indicates a case of intercultural miscommunication. Interpreting the dialogue between father and son (M. Arlen and M.J. Arlen) who have not met each other for years, the author writes:

Son thanked a lot, father failed to notice. (M. Arlen "Exiles" p. 41)

As a cultural insider, I am aware that in Armenian culture it is not customary to thank one's parents. Not that children do not respect their parents, on the contrary, they do respect them greatly, they obey their parents and try to please them. Anyhow, it is

not common to display one's gratefulness for the parents explicitly and say performatively: *Thank you father, thank you mother for buying new clothes for me, or for paying for my education, etc.* In other words, in Armenian culture it is taken for granted that parents should attend to their children throughout their whole life and the latter should be loyal to their parents despite their age and need for parental concern. Obviously, the piece of discourse where the author notes that the son thanks his father repeatedly but the father does not react to it can be interpreted as a case of cross-cultural miscommunication: the author clearly indicates that the son belongs to a different culture: the father does not expect explicit verbal expression of gratitude from his son and neglects it.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to go back to the first part of the article where I discussed the phenomenon of cultural adaptation. As I stated, according to S. Ang's definition, cultural adaptation comprises two dimensions: socio-cultural and psychological adjustment. The cross-cultural discourse analysis of the autobiographical novels and short stories by American Armenian writers as well as my personal experience and numerous encounters with Americans of Armenian descent make me believe strongly that the descendants of the refugee Armenians have successfully accomplished the first dimension of cultural adaptation – socio-cultural adjustment. This aspect of acculturation concerns the external, behavioural side of adaptation and, therefore, is related to one's senses, that is what one sees, hears, feels and tries to fit in. Admittedly, the refugee Armenians had no choice: having been given a chance to live, they had to survive by yielding a certain portion of their socio-cultural identity, a certain part of their global mindset. Analysing the process of cultural remodelling on the example of American Armenian literary heroes which is described by writers of Armenian origin, we conclude that as a result of acculturation these ethnic Armenians lost most of the tip-of-the iceberg features: they adopted the language of the target culture as well as certain behavioural patterns characteristic of this culture.

Now the question arises about psychological adjustment which, undoubtedly, is a more complicated and difficult process. Psychological adjustment is what one's soul feels. It is linked with subconscious spheres of brainwork which are out of conscious control and cannot be easily regulated by individuals. Hence having been forcefully uprooted from their natural habitat, their ordinary physical environment, and inhabiting in a different land which has become their home or native country, at some deep level of the psyche, people of Armenian descent are still residing in Western Armenia. Psychologically they are still members of Armenian community, bearers of common historical memory, core Armenian values and subconsciously share certain specific psychological traits. As a result this aspect of acculturation of Armenians has not been accomplished in full and the Americans of Armenian descent in particular and, presumably, most Diasporan Armenians instinctively feel some dark, veiled signals of

call – *call of blood*. as we, Armenians say, which they cannot fully realize. These signals indicate faint alienation from the target culture, that is American culture and affiliation with source, that is Armenian culture. Most probably, the heavy psychological burden of the traumatic psychological mind of the generations of Armenians does not allow them to get psychologically adapted to the new environment. Hence the cross-cultural discourse analysis carried out in this paper enables me to conclude that Americans of Armenian descent, and perhaps other Diasporan Armenians as well have multicultural social identity.

Notes:

1. Official statistic analysis comes to prove that at present less than one thirds of the total number of Armenians living in the world, about 3 million Armenians, reside in modern Armenia, RA, and two-thirds, about 7 million Armenians, live abroad, forming the huge Armenian Diaspora.
2. In fact, the world did not know how to deal with the extensive and continuous flow of the Armenian refugees across the borders in Europe and Asia. This kind of mass migration was unprecedented at the rise of the 20th century. As you may know, a number of human rights conventions related to forced migration were adopted by the United Nations much later.
3. G. Hofstede, as we know, identifies five value dimensions (individualism vs. collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, masculinity vs. femininity, long- vs. short-term orientation) that are influenced and modified by culture (Hofstede 2012). According to him, in individualistic cultures the ties between individuals are loose, everyone is expected to look after him/herself and his/her immediate family. The loyalty of individualists to a group is weak. They feel they belong to many groups and are apt to change their membership as it suits them, changing churches, employers and so on. In collectivist cultures people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, often extended families (with uncles, aunts, grandparents) that continue protecting them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. Collectivistic cultures emphasize community, collaboration, shared interest, harmony, tradition, the public good, and maintaining face. Individualistic cultures emphasize personal rights and responsibilities, privacy, voicing one's opinion, freedom, innovation, and self-expression (Samovar, Porter, McDaniel 2009:198-199).

References:

1. Ang, S.; Van Dyne, L.; Tan, M.L. (2011) *Cultural Intelligence*. // Cambridge Handbook on Intelligence. / Ed. by R.J. Sternberg and S.B. Kaufman. NY: CUP. pp. 582-602.
2. Arlen, M.J. (1975) *Passage to Ararat*. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

3. Balakian, P. (2003) *The Burning Tigris: The Armenian Genocide and America's Response*. N.Y.: Harper Collins Publishers.
4. Bedoukian, K. (1979) *Some of Us Survived: The Story of an Armenian Boy*. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
5. Calonne, D.S. (2007) *Michael J. Arlen. // Forgotten Bread. / Ed. by D. Kherdian*. Berkeley, California: Heyday Books. pp. 299-303.
6. Gasparian, D. (2014) *Tseghaspanut'ian artatsolumy anliagir hai groghneri yerkerum. // Garun, 11-12. pp. 4-15.*
7. Hart'unian, A.H. (1999) *An Odyssey of Faith: Neither to Laugh nor to Weep; A Memoir of the Armenian Genocide*. Belmont, Massachusetts: Armenian Heritage Press.
8. Hofstede, G. (2012) *Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. // Intercultural Communication. / Ed. by L.A. Samovar, R.E. Porter, E.R. McDaniel*. Boston: Wadsworth. pp. 19-34.
9. Hovannisian, R.G. (ed.) (1992) *The Armenian Genocide: History, Politics, Ethics*. NY: St. Martin's Press.
10. Hovannisian, R.G. (ed.) (1997) *The Armenian People from Ancient to Modern Times*. Vol. 2. NY: St. Martin's Press.
11. Kherdian, D. (2007) *Introduction. // Forgotten Bread. / Ed. by D. Kherdian*. Berkeley, California: Heyday Books. pp. xi-xiv.
12. Kouymjian, H.D. (1985) *Refugee Girl*. Watertown, Massachusetts: Baikar.
13. Morgenthau, H. (1918) *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
14. Paronyan, Sh. (2011) *Lezvachanachoghut'un yev diskurs*. Yerevan: YSU Press.
15. Paronyan, Sh.; Rostomyan, A. (2011) *The Pragmatic Impact of Background Emotional Memory on Interpersonal Relations. // Armenian Folia Anglistika. / International Journal of English Studies, N1-2(9). Yerevan: Lusakn. pp. 7-15.*
16. Paronyan, Sh.; Bekaryan, L. (2013) *Verbalization of Interpersonal Conflict in Fiction. // Studia Filologica. Zbornik naukovikh prats. Vipusk 2. Kiev: Kievski universitet im. Grinchenka. pp. 60-66.*
17. Peterson, B. (2004) *Cultural Intelligence*. Boston, London: Nicholas Brealey.
18. Samovar, L.A.; Porter, R.E.; McDaniel, E.R. (2009) *Communication between Cultures*. Boston: Wadsworth.
19. Samovar, L.A.; Porter, R.E.; McDaniel, E.R. (2012) *Intercultural Communication*. Boston: Wadsworth.

Sources of Data:

1. Arlen, M.J. (1970) *Exiles*. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
2. Sourian, P. (1965) *The Gate*. NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.
3. Saroyan, W. (1941) *My Name is Aram*. London: Faber and Faber.
4. Saroyan, W. (1975) *The Foreigner. // Selected Short Stories*. M.: Progress. pp. 244-257.

Եղեռնից հետո տեղահանված հայերի մշակութային վերափոխման քննությունը

Հոդվածը նվիրված է եղեռնը վերապրած արևմտահայերի մշակութային հենքի ձևափոխման խնդիրներին: Հոդվածագրի նպատակն է քննության առնել Ամերիկայում բնակություն հաստատած հայերի և նրանց սերունդների մշակութային հարմարակման գործընթացը, որի արդյունքում նրանց բնիկ մշակութային ծրագիրը փոխվել է դառնալով սփյուռքահայ մշակութային ավանդույթ: Մշակութային հենքի ձևափոխման երևույթը լուսաբանելու նպատակով վերլուծության են ենթարկվել գեղարվեստական տեքստի նմուշներ, որոնց հերոսները ամերիկահայերի երեք տարբեր սերունդների ներկայացուցիչներ են: Փաստական նյութի վերլուծությունը կատարվել է միջմշակութային գործարանության և դիսկուրսի տեսության շրջանակներում: Մշակութային հայեցակերպով կատարված դիսկուրսի քննությունը թույլ է տալիս եզրակացնել, որ սփյուռքահայերի մշակութային հենքը բազմամշակութայնությունն է:

Исследование культурного ремоделирования армян, эмигрировавших после геноцида

В статье затрагивается одна из наиболее болезненных тем в истории Армении – геноцид армян в 1915 году и его печальный результат – насильственные депортации и культурное ремоделирование этнических армян, переживших геноцид. Целью статьи является анализ процесса аккультурации эмигрировавших в США армян и их потомков. Автор утверждает, что в результате этого процесса культурное наследие армян изменилось, перевоплотившись в культурную традицию диаспоры. Чтобы проиллюстрировать примеры культурного ремоделирования, были изучены художественные произведения, где литературными героями являются три поколения американских армян. Работа выполнена в русле межкультурной прагматики и теории дискурса. Анализ дискурса с позиций межкультурной прагматики позволяет автору сделать вывод о том, что социальная личность армян диаспоры является мультикультурной.