

Red Army, practically speaking. The Ottoman Turks were advancing on the remnant of the Armenian people in Erevan Guberniia. The other Transcaucasian people, the Georgians and Azerbaijani Turks, declared their independence. The Armenians, who had hoped for protection from the Turks in a Transcaucasian Union, were forced to go it alone.

The first winter (1918–19) in the Armenian Republic was a demographic disaster second only to the massacres of 1915–16. The author states that about two hundred thousand people, almost 20 percent of the republic's population, died of hunger or disease by mid-1919. The disaster would have been greater had it not been for the help of American Near East Relief. This private philanthropic organization began operations in Armenia in March 1919 and delivered over nine million dollars worth of food and clothing to the Armenians. This effort was supplemented later in 1919 by two million dollars worth of public American Relief Administration supplies. It is comforting to read in 1972 that some of our overseas activities have not been self-serving or destructive.

During the remainder of the book the reader is lost in a sandpile of details. The author could remedy this defect in the two additional volumes he is preparing. He could provide periodic "situation reports" covering the geographic, demographic, technological, sociological, and ideological dimensions of the moment. He could relate the episode under discussion to his main theme: did it help or hinder the survival of the Armenian people? I believe that the writer of a narrative is more successful if he does not look down at his feet as he proceeds, but forward at the path ahead.

MARY K. MATOSSIAN  
*University of Maryland*

BRIDGE ACROSS THE BOSPORUS: THE FOREIGN POLICY OF TURKEY. By *Ferenc A. Váli*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1971. xiv, 410 pp. \$12.50.

One of the major differences between Turkish life of the 1950s and that of the 1960s and 1970s is the increasing concern with foreign policy. Although domestic issues are still predominant on the political scene, foreign affairs compete more and more for the attention of the urban and rural Turk alike. High on the list of concerns are Cyprus, relations with the United States, Turkey's role in NATO, Turkey's position on the Arab-Israeli conflict, and her new emerging relations with the Soviet Union. After a brief and somewhat pedestrian review of the main lines of Ottoman and Republican foreign affairs, Professor Váli's work takes up those issues one by one.

Thoroughly grounded in the secondary literature and at home in the maze of Turkish newspapers and journalistic periodicals, Váli has written an informed and spirited account. Description is his strong suit, although at times he does come to grips with the problems of analysis. The radical shift in Turkish opinion from pro- to anti-Americanism is chronicled in detail. President Johnson's letter of 1964 on the Cyprus situation is correctly highlighted as the catalyst that changed the chemistry of Turkish-American relations. From then on it was all down hill. So closely identified were Turkish and American interests that any dislocation in the central Turkish-American relationship caused ramifications throughout the entire range of Turkey's foreign relations. As a result of the erosion of Turkey's trust in

the United States over the Cyprus issue, Turkey has rethought her position on her relations with NATO; she has drawn away from the American line on the Arab-Israeli question and closer to the position of her Muslim neighbors, although her relations with Israel are still cordial. Turkey has also found it necessary to open a window to the Soviet Union.

Just how all this was accomplished is recorded in this work, which tries to break the traditional mold of foreign policy studies. Váli does attempt to relate foreign policy to internal developments, but those are so complicated that the task cannot be managed within the scope of this one volume. That task would have been facilitated by a more thorough familiarity with the legacy of traditional society in the political sphere and a deeper understanding of Turkish urban upper-class life. The interconnecting web of personal relations still determines a good deal of what goes on in the political realm, and cannot be divorced from the field of foreign policy. For example, accounts relating to the treatment of Adnan Menderes and his supporters are still not paid in full, and that continues to play an important role in the political life of Turkey.

Cyprus is the key to understanding Turkish foreign policy. Váli does not shy away from dealing with the Turkish feeling that pro-Greek, pro-Christian elements in the State Department tipped the balance in favor of Greece. It will be some time before historians can examine the record on that score, but until then it is hard to fault the Turks on this one. It is unfair to ask that Váli tell us in this book why it was that America fouled the cosiest nest it had in the post-World War II era. I am sure he would agree that the makers of American foreign policy have never really understood or even tried to understand Turkey. Too many of the ambassadors have been old Arab hands who were assigned to Ankara as a place for their R and R. A lot of people were asleep at the switch in 1964. One hopes that Váli will turn his talents to that question soon, and tell us who they were and why it happened.

NORMAN ITZKOWITZ  
Princeton University

THE ADOLESCENT. By *Fyodor Dostoevsky*. Translated, with an introduction, by *Andrew R. MacAndrew*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971. xxxiii, 585 pp. \$10.00.

In the opening paragraph of the fictional memoirs which constitute the novel *Podrostok*, Arkadii Dolgoruky declares that he has decided to record "slovo v slovo" all that has happened to him during the past year. Arkadii's inappropriate use of this conventional phrase is ironically symptomatic of the naïveté that underlies his autobiographical enterprise, in which he repeatedly disavows all artfulness and literary sophistication in the interest of sheer, raw honesty and fidelity to fact. Subtly the phrase emphasizes the distance that separates narrator from author in this novel. Dostoevsky is very much aware, as Arkadii is not, that reality is not constituted of words that present themselves to be accurately transcribed by the scrupulous chronicler. At this point, however, as throughout his translation, MacAndrew comes to Arkadii's assistance where Dostoevsky leaves him to founder within the confines of his own sensibility. Instead of choosing the exact English equivalent, "word for word," the translator mutes the sense of Arkadii's epistemo-