

of *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, diagrams the variegated nature of diasporic groups in terms of their level of integration: “the assimilated or nearly assimilated; the comfortably ethnicized; the new migrants or refugees who still hold on to, or are in the grip of, traditional homeland identities; and the diasporic elements.”⁴ His articles in *Diaspora*, such as the one quoted here, are informed by his continued close contact with Armenian communities scattered throughout the world.

Along with the temporal transformation within diasporan communities, the crisis of identity and dual loyalty to Armenian roots and the country of citizenship began to emerge, with no solution in sight, as of yet. The only way out was to avoid the issue altogether, either by staying within the boundaries of the ghetto, holding on to the ideal, and not seeing the truth, or by drifting away and surrendering to the sweeping tide of assimilation. It was the second generation—born in the host country to immigrant/exile parents—that would seek new means of survival and new avenues of expression in order to create a niche within the mainstream culture/literature as members of mainstream society and the

⁴ Khachig Tölölyan, “Elites and Institutions in the Armenian Transnation,” *Diaspora* 9:1 (2000): 113. Discussion of theories of diaspora as they apply to the Armenian case is beyond the scope of this study. As a source of background information that may be helpful for a better understanding of this book, I recommend Tölölyan’s *Sp’iurk’i mej* [In the Diaspora] (Paris: Matenashar “Haraj,” 1980), consisting of essays that address the culture and the institutional structure of the Armenian Diaspora. Further reading from the same author is the paper he presented at the High-Level Expert Forum on Capacity Building for Peace and Development: Roles of Diaspora, Toronto, Canada, October 19–20, 2006. His presentation was published as Booklet 1.