

free, including Dr. iur. Doğu Perinçek, whose successful legal case for the right to denounce the Armenian genocide as an “imperialist fib” Cheterian describes in the section “Freedom of Expression” (pp. 303-305).

This otherwise instructive and very readable monograph might have focused some of its attention on the opinion-building role of school education and media in Turkey. The foundation of the Turkish republic and the CUP’s genocide perpetrators are to this day commemorated with pride. Mosques, schools and kindergartens, boulevards and public squares in Turkey continue to bear the name of high ranking perpetrators. And Turkish school textbooks for history continue to distort or minimize the historic facts and depict Christian minorities in Turkey as hostile and unreliable.

At any rate, one cannot but agree with the author’s frustrating conclusions that the “Turkish Deep State and the denial of the Armenian Genocide are intimately linked” and that the rule of law and democracy therefore depend on Turkey’s readiness to face its recent past (p. 308). Cheterian is sure that this will happen, albeit not in near future.

Tessa Hofmann
Free University, Berlin

CHABOT, Joceline, Richard Godin, Stefanie Kappler, and Sylvia Kasparian, eds.
– *Mass Media and the Genocide of the Armenians: One Hundred Years of Uncertain Representation*. Palgrave Studies in the History of Genocide. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. Pp. 241.

The editors of this most useful volume lay out their theoretical framework in an enlightening introduction. Joceline Chabot (Université de Moncton), Richard Godin (Université Laval), Stefanie Kappler (Durham University), and Sylvia Kasparian (Université de Moncton) argue that “representation [...] is a social and political process that is never neutral,” (p. 6) For the most part the nine essays authored by a variety of scholars that comprise this volume attest to the veracity of that statement; at the least they test it.

Continuing the argument laid out in the introduction, Adam Muller (University of Manitoba) raises a significant question in Chapter 1: since representation inevitably involves some kind of aesthetic order, can an aesthetic order be established in the representation of genocide without distorting the essence of that genocide with all its consequences, especially when the pain of genocide has been described as ‘indescribable’?

Analyzing the case of “Ravished Armenia,” a 1919 film about the Genocide in chapter 2, Sévane Garibian (University of Geneva and University of Neuchâtel) maintains that with reproducibility, works of art acquire a political function with a corresponding loss of aura.

Extending Garibian's analysis and considering posters and other representations of the violence involved in the Armenian Genocide, Benedetta Guerzoni, an independent scholar of images of violence, highlights the racist and sexist character of art works designed or chosen to communicate the violence and pain of the victims. Guerzoni also ties what was offered to audiences after the war to the heightened insecurities of men in a changing world.

Recently retired from the Free University of Berlin, Tessa Hofmann discusses the dilemma of the German press regarding the policies of Germany's ally, the Ottoman government toward its Armenian population in Chapter 4. That press was torn between Germany's interests and the scope and level of atrocities being committed by the Ottoman government. Hofmann traces the history of the coverage of the Armenian question until recent times.

In Chapter 5, Lousine Abrahamyan of the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia narrates the coverage of events in the Ottoman Empire and the story of Russian Armenian assistance to refugees and orphans who had survived the massacres and deportations, focusing on the newspaper established in Moscow for that purpose, *Armianskiy Vestnik*.

Dominica Maria Maclos (Cardinal Stefan Wyszinski University in Warsaw) contributes to the debate in Chapter 6 by pointing to the different positions of the three segments of Polish society on the Armenian Genocide. The division of Poland between Germany, Austria and Russia, indeed, occurred during and immediately after its occurrence.

In the next chapter, Susan Meryem Rosita AlJadeeah, a doctoral researcher at the European University Institute in Florence, and Sait Çetinoğlu, human rights activist and member of the Free University, explore the representation of the Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman press during the little explored period of 1918 to 1919, emphasizing the economic factors that contributed to the execution, if not logic, of the massacres and deportations.

Chapter 8 is a most interesting contribution to the volume by three of the four editors of the book. In this essay, Joceline Chabot, Richard Godin, and Sylvia Kasparian provide a comparative analysis of the way French-language newspapers in Canada covered the events in the Ottoman Empire during World War I. The remarkable aspect of this essay is the use of Sphinx and Hyperbase programs to trace the use of violence-related terms and the comparison of their use in reports of German and Ottoman atrocities.

In the final chapter, Claire Mouradian (CNRS, Paris) presents the case of Rabbi S. Wise, an ardent champion of the causes of the Jewish and Armenian peoples. She raises the question of whether his knowledge of the massacres and deportations of the Armenian people and his attempts at making political and other authorities aware of the situation, and at providing help, made any difference in the attitude of the great powers toward the Jewish Holocaust.

This volume marks significant advances in the study of the Genocide of the Armenian people in four distinct ways. First, it belongs to a new generation of books that justifiably take the fact of the Genocide for granted and begin to explore the questions that such a catastrophe raises. In this case, the focus is

on the coverage of that catastrophe in media. Second, the volume goes beyond the mere collection of newspaper articles by offering, besides in-depth analyses of press coverage, an analysis of film. Third, the nine chapters collected in the volume bring together coverage of the Genocide in geographic areas, times, and issues that are rarely considered (Canada, for example). More than one essay highlights the significance of wartime state censorship of the press. Fourth, it offers a theoretical framework for the reception of media coverage of the event that focuses on “the rhetoric and representation” of the event, and on the contested nature of that representation. The volume, therefore, constitutes a remarkable contribution to our understanding of the relationship between media and historical memory.

The volume does have some problems, however. A more thorough summary of the period under study in the introduction would have been useful for the reader. Clearly not all chapters contribute directly to the debate implied in the title and initiated in the introduction. A few are simply narratives, detached from this debate and lacking solid contextualization.

The volume could also have benefitted from an analysis, even a brief one, of the relevance of media representations of the Armenian Genocide today, and of their bearing on the political behavior of Armenian polities today.

There certainly would have been room in the appropriate chapters to mention at least two recent works, among others, that are relevant to the debate, Marie-Aude Baronian’s *Mémoire et Image. Regards sur la catastrophe arménienne* (2013), and Muge Gocek’s *Denial of Violence: Ottoman Past, Turkish Present, and Collective Violence against the Armenians, 1789-2009* (2015), as well as an earlier volume that reproduced a large number of articles, *The Genocide arménien dans la presse Canadienne/The Armenian Genocide in the Canadian Press*, (1985). Finally, the volume could also have benefitted from a more rigorous copy editing.

These critical comments do not reduce the value of this volume for its sheer scope and contribution to the critical understanding between representation in media, politics, and historical memory.

Gerard J. Libaridian
Cambridge, Mass.

AKÇAM, Taner and Umit Kurt – *The Spirit of the Laws: The Plunder of Wealth in the Armenian Genocide*. Translated by Aram Arkun. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2015, Pp. 206.

Once the Armenian and Assyrians peoples were deported out of their historic lands and decimated through barbaric acts, there remained the question of the property, land, wealth, and civilization left behind. There was also the issue of survivors and their descendants who could have claims over what was euphemistically called ‘Abandoned Properties’ thus leading to the creation and refinement of the