

different countries. There is also a set of useful external links into other public-access online collections. But it should also be noted that there is already a lot of primary material freely available online and unless one is particularly looking to work on something strongly represented in this collection (for example trench journals) this may not be the obvious first choice. It is nevertheless easy to see how a first-rate undergraduate or Masters level dissertation could be done entirely from this collection, and that should be welcome.

Where I find it easiest to imagine using this collection is in compiling course materials for teaching. Indeed, with a bit of imagination one could anticipate using it as a form of 'text book' for a class. But on that basis it needs to be pointed out that it does have some limitations. The participating institutions produce a vision of the First World War that is predominantly an Anglophone one. The result is a heavy concentration on the northern part of the Western Front, fairly good documentation for the Middle East and a certain amount on the Italian Front and the Balkans. The participation of Stuttgart brings in some primary material from the Eastern Front, and the Cambridge collection adds some more, but, as a view of the war as a whole, France, the Habsburg Empire and Russia are under-represented here.

My final thought is that I would rather see archives commercially digitised than not at all, but my first choice would always be that they be made freely available. My worry is always that projects such as this may pre-empt the best option.

ADRIAN GREGORY

*Pembroke College, Oxford*

doi:10.1093/ehr/cet133

*The Armenian Genocide: A Complete History*, by Raymond Kévorkian (New York: I.B. Tauris, 2011; pp. 1,029. £45).

In this monumental work on the Armenian Genocide, the subtitle underlines that what is presented here is *a* complete history, thereby subtly recognising that it cannot be *the* complete history of the Armenian Genocide. Still, especially in comparison to the existing works in the field, Raymond Kévorkian comes closest to providing 'the' complete history. In addition, he also very ably contextualises the Genocide within a wider political, social and economic framework—a feature that is missing in most works on the topic. As such, this large volume is a most welcome addition to the study of the Armenian Genocide, and one that will immediately become an indispensable reference book.

Kévorkian's massive 1,029-page study is divided into six parts. The first three set the stage for the analysis by focusing on the emerging relationship between the Young Turks and Armenians, who are first intertwined in opposition (1895–1908), then face the test of gaining political power (1908–12), and finally come to oppose each other (December 1912–March 1915). Especially significant in this historical context are the increasingly Turkist policies of the Young Turks' organisation, the Committee of Union and Progress (hereafter CUP), towards the Armenians on the one side, and the negotiations of the Armenian authorities, revolutionaries and organisations—with each other as well as with the CUP—on the other.

This larger political and ideological framework articulated in Parts I, II and III sets the stage for Kévorkian's ensuing analysis of the Armenian Genocide in two phases. The first phase commences with analysis of the Ottoman Empire on the eve of the First World War in 1914 and then delves into a most meticulously detailed study of the forced Armenian deportations and subsequent massacres which occurred during the winter, summer and autumn of 1915. Indeed, this first phase, discussed in Part IV, takes up about a third of the entire book, as Kévorkian carefully articulates in twenty-plus chapters the atrocities that occurred throughout the central lands of the empire, in the provinces of Erzurum, Van, Bitlis, Diyarbakir, Harput/Elazığ, Sivas, Trabzon, Ankara, Kastamonu, Istanbul, Edirne/Çanakkale, İzmit, Bursa/Kütahya, Aydın, Konya, the Baghdad railroad route, Zeytun/Dörtöyol, Maraş, Adana, Antep/Antakya and Urfa. In doing so, he presents the most extensive use of archival and historical sources that we, the reviewers, have ever witnessed, including Ottoman Turkish *and* Armenian newspapers, periodicals, archival documents and memoirs *as well as* British, American, French, German and Arabic printed and archival sources. It should be noted in this context that the footnotes alone comprise almost a quarter of the book. As a consequence of this almost superhuman effort, Kévorkian fully documents, without the shadow of a doubt, the destruction wrought upon the Armenian community of the empire by the Young Turk government with the participation of the local populace. The second phase of the genocide, discussed in Part V, covers the period from autumn 1915 to the end of the following year, tracing the tragic fate of those forcibly deported and massacred Armenians. Kévorkian focuses especially on the organisations established by the Young Turk government to finalise the destruction, including discussions of the temporary travel posts that quickly turned into concentration camps.

In Part VI, the author moves chronologically to the post-genocide period, lasting from 1917 to the early 1920s. Included here are the wars in the Caucasus as well as the debates and trials regarding the crime committed against the Armenians. What is especially highlighted are the truncated trials of the Young Turk leaders and the majority of the perpetrators who not only did not have to account for the violence they committed, but metamorphosed into the Republican leaders of the Turkish nation-state. Kévorkian concludes his analysis by ably articulating the continuity between the CUP political cadres and ideology and the newly-emerging Republican Turkey.

What are the major contributions of this massive work to the study of collective violence in history in general and the Armenian Genocide in particular? First, existing scholarship has often been fragmented across time and space. Spatially, it has focused either on the international context to the detriment of the local one, or on a particular local context to the detriment of the larger political, economic and social framework. Temporally, it has either analysed with broad brushstrokes the period of Armenian destruction, extending from the ancient to the present, or concentrated almost exclusively on a particular year or at most two years (1915–16). Yet Kévorkian's work temporally covers the crucial three decades from the mid-1890s to the 1920s, and does so spatially across the entirety of the Ottoman lands where the Armenians lived. As such, the work makes a major contribution to the historiography of the Armenian Genocide by expanding the boundaries of this historiography across time and space. Second, existing scholarship has often been limited

by its historical sources. Very few scholars have been able to cross the divide between the Turkish and Armenian-language sources on the one side, and the Western European and non-Western language sources on the other. As a consequence, the existing historiography of the collective violence committed against the Armenians has been partial, where the narration often privileges the often disparate standpoints of the Western Europeans, Armenians or Turks. Kévorkian's ability to employ and draw from *all* of these sources enables him to present, for the first time, as full and complete a portrayal of this violent past as possible.

The one significant limitation of this immense work concerns its periodisation. Kévorkian's analysis effectively begins with the emergence of the Young Turk and Armenian opposition to Sultan Abdülhamid II (r. 1876–1909), thereby identifying these newly-emergent 'modern' groups as the main social and political actors of his historical narrative. As a result he interprets the CUP's strategy and ideology toward the Armenians in terms not of the continuity of the previous Hamidian policy, but rather as a new, radical shift during which the CUP gradually developed the idea of creating a Turkish nation state—one that explicitly and violently excluded non-Turkish, and especially non-Muslim, communities from the empire. In fact, Kévorkian argues that '[t]he Hamidian practice of partial amputation of the Armenian social body for the purpose, as it were, of reducing it to politically acceptable proportions, cannot be put on the same level as the policy of ethnic homogenization conceived by the CUP' (p. 807). Yet, such periodisation overlooks the preceding incidents of violence against the Ottoman Armenians, especially those which took place in Asia Minor between 1893 and 1896, when approximately 300,000 to 600,000 Armenians lost their lives. One can even trace the social polarisation that set in between the dominant Muslim Turkish majority and non-Muslim minorities of the empire back to the reign (1789–1807) of Sultan Selim III, when the systematic modernisation of the empire began. Given the monumental amount of knowledge and information already present in this colossal work, however, it should perhaps fall to future scholars to extend the periodisation back to the beginning of Ottoman imperial reform efforts on the one side, and forward to the contemporary Turkish Republican period on the other.

FATMA MÜGE GÖÇEK and DZOVINAR DERDERIAN  
*University of Michigan, Ann Arbor*

doi:10.1093/ehr/cett60

*The Minority Voice: Hubert Butler and Southern Irish Protestantism, 1900–1991*,  
by Robert Tobin (Oxford: Oxford U.P., 2012; pp. 302. £65).

In recent years in Ireland there has been a considerable increase of scholarly interest in the history both of religious minorities and of social attitudes to ethnic and cultural diversity. The sources available are rich and diverse, ranging from church and business records to the writings and private correspondence of community leaders such as the man-of-letters, public moralist and human rights campaigner Hubert Butler. The latter left copious records covering a substantial part of the twentieth century, a collection that offers the opportunity