A REPLY TO CYNTHIA BECKER

HELENE E. HAGAN
doi:10.1017/S0020743808081853

Cynthia evokes scents and sounds of Berber life and declares that those are needed in one's experience in order to understand Berber arts. Thus, she confirms my own sentiment: I was born in Morocco in 1939 and raised there by Berber women, including my own mother. My paternal Berber grandfather, Mustapha, who had a great deal of influence on my upbringing, was an Ait Atta man. I was steeped in Berber lore, music, and culture from the day I was born until adulthood.

Although familiar with the distinctions raised by Cynthia Becker in defense of her book and the anthropological discourse on gender she attempts to use, I disagree with her on the way she uses those arguments to illustrate the impact of her women friends on Amazigh identity. She alludes to her field of study, which I believe is history, but mine is anthropology. I was asked to review her work as a woman born and raised in Morocco, of Berber ancestry, and with a number of professional years both in the arts and as an advocate of Amazigh rights and identity. I thus reviewed her book from an anthropological viewpoint with the added advantage of being an Amazigh, an artist, and a cultural advocate.

For the record, I did not "lament" that the book was not a survey of Amazigh arts throughout Morocco. I stated that Cynthia Becker incorrectly titled her book, and she admits to that. Furthermore, there is no confusion on my part, as she would like readers to believe, about the various points she makes in her book, including the much debated yet unresolved identity of the Haratines and their relationship to Amazigh people. My background includes the psychology of the feminine, and my specialization in anthropology was ritual and mind. There is no fuzziness whatsoever in my estimation of her discourse on women, ritual, and the symbolism of Amazigh identity through the arts. I find her approach thin in some regards, and I expressed that point of view with the utmost care and respect for her limited experience of my Amazigh culture.

A REPLY TO JUDITH E. TUCKER'S EXCERPT OF VAHAKN DADRIAN'S ARTICLE, "THE NAIM-ANDONIAN DOCUMENTS" (*IJMES* 40 [2008]: 171–79; REPRINT FROM *IJMES* 18 [1986]: 311–60)

MICHAEL M. GUNTER
doi:10.1017/S0020743808081865

I read with no little degree of amazement Judith Tucker's celebration and partial reprint of Vahakn N. Dadrian's "ground-breaking" (p. 171) 1986 article about the Naim-Andonian documents supposedly proving the Armenian genocide. Tucker makes no mention that at the time Dadrian originally published his article, I immediately questioned the validity of the documents (*IJMES* 19 [1987]: 523–24). They are riddled with internal inconsistencies, and the originals have long since conveniently disappeared.

I am not alone in this position, and for the sake of its own scholarly reputation *IJMES* should at least recognize this. Although Dadrian had the audacity to argue incongruously that "the presence and easy detection of such defects in the material under review militate against that charge [of forgery]" (p. 176), common sense would seem to argue the opposite. The manifest inconsistencies

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020743808081853 Published online by Cambridge University Press