

and the previously published artistic literature of the Armenian Genocide.

These new manifestations of the truth reveal a conscious or subconscious affinity with postmodern history as it pertains to transgression of the boundary between history and fiction.¹⁷ In an interview, Michel Foucault said, “I am well aware that I have never written anything but fictions. I do not mean to say, however, that truth is therefore absent. It seems to me that the possibility exists for fiction to function in truth...”¹⁸ Foucault’s postmodernist approach to history, especially as reflected in the statement quoted above, has given rise to multiple interpretations aiming to understand the concept and parameters of postmodern history which differ greatly from traditional approaches and may even suggest rewriting the past for a purpose. Without entering into that discussion, I use Foucault’s approach to show the importance and the significance of genocide literature, the literature of atrocities, in constructing the historical narrative of the period with a focus on human relationships rather than documents and statistics. The purpose: writing history to expose the injustice and to emphasize the necessity and the obligation to redress and rectify.

of Max von Scheubner-Richter (London: Taderon Press for the Gomidas Institute, 2008); Jakob Künzler, *In the Land of Blood and Tears* (in Armenian translation) (Yerevan: Armenian Genocide Museum-Institute, 2011); and Clara Barton, *Expedition in Asia Minor and Relief Operation* (Yerevan: Armenian Genocide Museum-Institute, 2012).

¹⁷ Peter Burke, “Two Crises of Historical Consciousness,” *Storia della Storiografia* 33 (1998): 3–16.

¹⁸ Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon, trans. Colin Gordon et al. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), p. 193.