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Summary
The wrong of genocide denial is usually described in terms of a further violation of the dignity of victims, survivors, and their descendants, by attacking their memory, and ultimately, the truth. This project sheds light on the relationship between dignity, memory, and truth in the context of genocide and its denial, by analyzing systematic genocide denialism under the normative framework of epistemic injustice.

Project Aims
• Formulation of a normative account of systematic and structural genocide denialism
• Identification of a particular source of social injustice/oppression and human rights violation
• Identification of perpetrators of epistemic injustice and ethical–cum-epistemic implications for post-genocidal societies more generally
• Improvement of our philosophical understanding of epistemic injustice and concepts like genocide, memory, identity, human dignity/rights and their interrelationship

Genocide Denialism: A Case Study
Turkey’s denialism of the Armenian genocide will be employed as a case study to illustrate the mechanisms through which genocide denialism may constitute an epistemic injustice. This is because it presents a systematic and structurally entrenched case of denialism, as well as a state-sanctioned discrimination policy that is upheld and gives rise to broad human rights violations in and beyond Turkey to this day.

Framing a «Denialist Debate»: Some Relevant Observations
Perpetuation of negative identity prejudice within the collective hermeneutical resource:
¬ Ignites public distrust in the memory and testimony of members of the former victim group
¬ Controls narrative positions of those who testify to the truth of genocide, i.e. puts them in an adversarial setting of maximal interpreter distrust and challenge

Institutionalized, structural denialism:
¬ Producing (racist) epistemologies of ignorance

Normative Framework: Epistemic Injustice (EI)
EI is an ‘intrinsic injustice’: it wrongs someone particularly in his or her epistemic agency and therefore in a vital human capacity. Three forms of EI suggested by the current literature will be critically discussed and applied to the case:
• Testimonial injustice:
  Identity-prejudicial credibility deficit/excess; impediment to transmission of (moral) knowledge or understanding
• Hermeneutical injustice:
  Gaps in (dominant) hermeneutical resources due to hermeneutical marginalization of victim group; impediment to (self-)understanding and intelligibility of social experiences
• Willful (culpable) hermeneutical ignorance:
  Production of ignorance and epistemic vices, e.g. close-mindedness; protecting privilege and hiding complicity with oppression