

IKONOMICHESKITE VRŪZKI NA BŪLGARIIA S RAZVIVASHTITE SE STRANI. By *Evgenii Kamenov, Todor Vŭlchev, and Eduard Malkhasian.* Afrikano-Aziatski Problemi, 1. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademiia na naukite, 1970. 147 pp. 1.44 lv., paper.

This is the first monograph in the Afro-Asian Problems series published by the Bulgarian Academy's Research Center for Africa and Asia. Like the four earlier publications of this recently established center, the new series is intended "to express the sympathy and support toward the suppressed and enslaved nations in their struggle to shake off the colonial tyranny" (preface, p. 5). This statement sets the tone for the substantive treatment, with scholarship a major casualty.

There is, of course, some informational value in the five overwhelmingly descriptive-ideological chapters, such as data on the absolute and relative levels of Bulgaria's trade with the developing countries (217.4 million leva or 5.5 percent in 1968), its concentration on the Arab states (48.6 percent), with a resulting favorable balance of trade, and the composition of its exports and imports. Of course, the regular publications of the Bulgarian Statistical Office contain many additional and more recent statistics. Of greater interest are the descriptions (by Malkhasian and Vŭlchev) of the country's relatively new ventures, such as the export of entire factories (for a modest total value of about 40 million leva in 1969), the design and construction of public works, and the provision of scientific and technical assistance and cooperation. (In 1968 about fifteen hundred Bulgarian specialists were involved in assistance programs in over twenty developing nations, and an equivalent number of students from these countries were enrolled in Bulgarian educational institutions.)

The authors, especially Academician E. G. Kamenov, one of the foremost ideological economists, reveal the regime's preference for following the Soviet approach—for example, by concentrating trade and aid on a relatively small number of states (such as the UAR in Africa, and India in Asia), and by stressing the advantages for developing countries of trade with socialist states, economically as well as politically. Given as an example is Bulgaria's own "enormous successes under socialism."

One has to grope in vain for meaningful analytical or theoretical material, or even for comprehensive empirical data and forecasts. But this publication follows the line of "partisan scholarship," and remains a monograph in name only.

L. A. D. DELLIN
University of Vermont

THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA. Vol. 1: THE FIRST YEAR, 1918-1919. By *Richard G. Hovannisian.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1971. xxiii, 547 pp. \$15.00.

Dr. Hovannisian is attempting to write the definitive history of the ill-fated Republic of Armenia (1918-20), and for the most part he is succeeding. His labor is exhaustive; his methods, meticulous; his sources, primary; his attitude, objective. It is unfortunate that this book will probably be read only by specialists in the field and by politically engag  Armenians of the Diaspora.

The author confirms the conclusion of Firuz Kazemzadeh that the Armenian Republic was founded in late May 1918 simply to make the best of a bad situation. At this time Bolshevik authority did not extend outside Russia and there was no

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