

adds, “Nothing brought people together more swiftly and strongly—though transiently and shakily—than a shared enemy” (p. 113). It is significant how she pairs the word “common” with the word “enemy.” The underlying meaning here repeats the Turkish idea of hostility toward the Turks as the basis of Diasporan Armenian identity. As to the transience of that bond when built upon the concept of a common enemy, I would argue that it is the memory of the cataclysmic past, the unsettled pain and the unhealed wound that binds Diasporan Armenians together and shapes their identity, and not the enmity against the Turk.

Since recognition of the Armenian Genocide was proposed to the United States Congress in 2007 in the form of House Resolution 106 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 106, the Turkish media have been inundated with articles emanating hatred and animosity, but among them one also finds cautious deliberation and a willingness to understand the Armenian issue and find a way out of the prescribed and petrified language of state denialism. In one of the more analytical articles, Doğu Ergil tries to understand the motivation behind the Diaspora Armenians’ push for this recognition. This recognition, or “validation,” he believes, “further reinforces their collective identity shaped by victimhood born out of a ‘chosen trauma’ [reference to the events of 1915].”⁹ He goes on to delineate the process of the transmission of the memory of that trauma from the original survivors of the trauma to the generations born to them, especially in circumstances generated by the inability to overcome the effects of the past

⁹ Ergil, “The Armenian Psyche” (2007).