

behind the destruction of Armenian cultural monuments. Successive Turkish governments knew well the value of these edifices in the perpetuation of historical memory among survivors and perpetrators alike. These monuments of the past lived not only in the present and imposed a certain sentiment about the truth denied, but they also lived for the future and could function to the same end in future generations. Destroying cultural monuments meant fragmenting the ethnic grouping around it, eliminating an element of difference, and weakening the foundations of their group identity. They had to be destroyed. In another country, a Bosnian woman survivor looking at a ruined edifice of Bosnia's cultural heritage reflected, "A dead woman is one of us. A destroyed bridge is all of us for ever."³²

The manner in which Yalçın presents the views of his interviewees, adding his own interpretations and analysis to them, is a clear indication of the author's full agreement with them and his siding with their view. In some instances, it is difficult to determine whether the statement or the analysis belongs to the Armenian interviewee or to Yalçın himself. This is particularly true when the subject matter is the government's mistreatment of its Armenian subjects, or the causes of the 1915 events, or when the future of the Turkish-Armenian relationship and their eventual coexistence is discussed.

Despite the government's tight control over the collective memory of its citizens, absolute erasure has not been achieved. Historical memory has been kept alive at least in the old

³² De Condapa, "Destroying Material Culture" (2007).