

BOOK REVIEW

ASAM INSTITUTE FOR ARMENIAN RESEARCH TAKES A CLOSER LOOK AT ARMENIAN PROPAGANDA

Book's Name: "ARARAT, ARTISTIC ARMENIAN PROPAGANDA"

Book's Original Name: **Ararat, Sanatsal Ermeni Propagandası**. Language: **Turkish**.

Authors: **Sedat LAÇİNER** and **Şenol KANTARCI**. Ankara: Institute for Armenian Research Publication, May 2002. 167 pages + xii + footnotes + bibliography + photos. ISBN: 975-6769-47-5.

Publisher: EREN, Konrad Adenauer Cad., No. 61, YILDIZ, ÇANKAYA, ANKARA, TURKEY.

Tel: 0090 312 491 70 14. Fax: 0090 312 491 70 13.

E-mail: info@eraren.org

Web: www.eraren.org

Assist. Prof. Dr. İhsan BAL*

Armenian - Canadian film director Atom Egoyan's Ararat film, which its promoters said is a "film on the Armenian genocide", was shown at the Cannes Film Festival in May. Many are concerned that Ararat will be a second "Midnight Express" leaving irremediable traces on the image of Turks and Turkey. ASAM Institute for Armenian Research's Assist. Prof. Dr. Sedat Laçiner and Şenol Kantarcı perhaps have been the first to react and draw attention to what the film may do to Turkey. Their book, which was published by ASAM's Armenian Institute, further focuses on the Armenian propaganda machine and how the extremist political groups abuse the Armenian art, notably Armenian cinema, in order to reach their political aims. The book is in Turkish, yet the authors declared that they intend to publish the 167-page book in English as well.

* Senior Lecturer in the *Turkish Police Academy*, Ankara. BA (Police Academy), MA (Leicester UK), PhD (Leicester, UK)

The book is divided into two main sections. In the first section, Assist. Prof. Dr. Sedat Laçiner looks at the Armenian propaganda and Armenian cinema as a tool of this propaganda while the second section written by Şenol Kantarcı focuses on the historical facts and comparison of Ararat's claims and the realities.

According to Laçiner, the diaspora Armenian organisations in particular built the Armenian identity on anti-Turkish feelings and they considered the cinema as the most important instrument in order to reach their aim. Laçiner also focuses on Atom Egoyan, director of Ararat film, and details the director's life and its impact on his cinema. Laçiner gives a special attention to the director's childhood. He says

"Egoyan is an identity-convert. He refused his Armenian identity in the early years and made efforts to be a 'normal' Canadian. He did not speak Armenian. However in the college years the radical Armenian nationalists helped him in building his national identity on anti-Turkish fleeing. Now he had an enemy, and he enjoyed being Armenian. He was Armenian because he was anti-Turkish. The 'genocide legacy' in particular played a crucial role in Egoyan's identity building like many Armenians in the diaspora. Though he had never seen Turkey or met a Turkish before he believed that the Turks had attempted to destroy his race. The nationalist trend in his character became significant when he got married with a fanatic Lebanese Armenian, Arsinée Khanjian".

According to Laçiner, similar to many converts, Egoyan exaggerated the past in order to legitimate his new identity. Thus "genocide legacy" became the most important and maybe the only uniting factors in the Armenian diaspora and Egoyan was no exception.

The third chapter of Laçiner's study is devoted to the film, Ararat, its script, financial sources and its impact on Armenians and the Western media. Laçiner argues that Ararat is a typical Armenian propaganda film and will damage the attempts for Turkish – Armenian dialogues. Though the director argued the film was a critical cinema film, Laçiner defends that Ararat is Egoyan's one of the worst films in terms of arts. Laçiner further argues,

"A good product requires effort, pain and meticulousness. Prejudice, ideological considerations and rough classifications of good and evil would not help to improve the artistic quality of a film. I do not think Egoyan is doing it with evil intention. The point

is that he is acting like a believer and as such does not question what is true and what is not. As he confessed he even refused to discuss 'the genocide issue'. When you reject a dialogue or debate on an issue you cannot claim that you make a critical film on that subject. Our research clearly proves that the extremist Armenian organisations in Canadian made enormous pressure on Egoyan, and furthermore his wife and his connections pushed him to make such a film. Actually two years ago he said that he was not a history film maker and he rejected to make a film on the 1915 events. It is clear that he could not resist the pressure from the Armenian organisations. Yet, this does not justify what he did, because he, as an intellectual, has a responsibility to question the problem and to search a way to help the Armenians and Turks to understand each other. All Egoyan admirers in Turkey expected a critical film on Turkish-Armenian relations or a film questioning the 'real reasons for the Armenian identity problem'. However it can be argued that Egoyan has chosen the easiest way and acted like a laymen, as an ordinary Armenian. As a result we the Turkish people and the Armenians lost an opportunity. It is unfortunate that Egoyan wasted a chance and now his and our grand-son and grand-daughters will have to face with the same problems."

The second section of the book is written by researcher Şenol Kantarcı. Kantarcı, first, analyses Ararat's script according to the historical events. Egoyan had claimed that the script was based on the book of Clarence Ussher, who worked as an American missionary in Turkey at that time. Kantarcı compares the script with that book and finds that Egoyan's Ararat does not match with Ussher's book. Many scenes do not exist in Ussher's book while the film, Ararat, distorts many of the events mentioned in the book. Then Kantarcı searches the events mentioned in the script by using other foreign missionaries' memoirs and the archival documents. Kantarcı argues that considered the historical realities and the mentioned book, Egoyan's film is full of mistakes and misjudgements. Egoyan further continues:

"Egoyan focused on the Armenian revolt in Van in 1915. However he does not say that the revolt ended with the victory of Armenians, when the Van governor was forced to flee and was replaced by an Armenian at the end of a joint attack by the Russian army, which entered the city at that time, and local Armenian forces. The Armenian-Russian joint attack resulted in the killing of more than 20,000 Van residents. However Egoyan's film distorts the historical facts."

"Ararat, Artistic Armenian Propaganda" book is the Institute's first but will not be the last publication. The Institute, which is the only and first Armenian research organisation in Turkey and possibly the greatest one in the world in terms of the number of the full-time staff employed, conducts research on all dimensions of the Armenian culture, history and political life.

* * *

Book's Name: **THE ARMENIAN QUESTION (1914 - 23)**
Author: **Mim Kemal ÖKE**. Oxford: the University Printing House, 1988. 295 pages. Bibliography, endnotes.
ISBN: 9963-565-16-6.

Damla Bade GÜMÜŞEL*

Turkey and the world have faced the Armenian terrorism during the 1970's. The Armenian terrorist group, ASALA, had carried out their actions against the Turkish Republic by murdering her diplomats and the officials. The only reason behind this ongoing psychological war against Turkey was to take the "revenge" of the so-called Armenian "genocide" in 1915. By this way their terrorist activities would be justified in the eyes of the Western public. However the operations of ASALA did not last for a long time and now it was time to take this duty for the Armenian diaspora by setting up a propaganda campaign. A large group of scholars from Armenian origin started to write about the Armenian civilians slaughtered by the Turks as during the application of relocation during the World War I. Armenian intellectuals followed a campaign of creating an "evil Turk" image in the Western public opinion even going too far by publishing some fake Ottoman documents. They try to draw some parallels between the Jewish Holocaust and their cause. In addition to these propaganda campaigns, the Armenian lobbies have been using all of their power within the political systems of various western countries in order to force Turkey to accept such a claim of genocide.

Unfortunately, the Turkish side insisted on keeping her silence against the Armenian claims for a very long time, which has created some question marks in the minds of people about the

* *ASAM Institute for Armenian Research, Ankara, Turkey.*

credibility of the Turkish side. Some laws on recognition of the so-called Armenian genocide were brought into the Western parliaments and discussed whether to ratify them or not. Such developments in recent years have become one of the biggest foreign policy concerns of Turkey. So, Turkish intellectuals and historians have started to work on this issue to inform the world about the real events that took place during the War and to prove the exaggeration or the fakeness of Armenian claims.

The Armenian Question by Mim Kemal Öke is one of the most remarkable books on this issue. As he also mentioned in his book, his main goal in writing this book was to investigate the Armenian issue without supporting the claims of any side and to build up his research by using the scientific research. According to him, the research on the Armenian issue should not be constrained by the historical facts but should be analyzed from a wider international context. So in this sense, this book is a scientific analysis on the Armenian problem for the readers who want to learn about the issue from every perspective.

In the first chapter, Öke analyzed the Armenian problem and the conditions of the international system by taking the issue from the 19th century until the end of World War I. The most important point about this chapter is that the author did not consider the issue only as a matter of minority problem but as a matter of international politics of that period. 1800's were a century of increased colonial rivalries between the European powers. New powers such as Italy and Germany had entered the international arena with the desire of catching up with the other powers in this colonial race. As the Ottoman Empire got weaker and weaker, it tried to keep its integrity by using the policy of balance of power against colonial powers. Until 1877, Britain was a great supporter of Ottoman integrity because of its security concerns in the East. However, when the Ottomans were defeated in the 1877 Ottoman-Russian War, Britain well understood that it was getting impossible to prevent disintegration of the Ottomans so it decided to secure the roots to its colonies by acquiring the Ottoman lands. In order to increase their influence over the empire, these powers started to propagate the minority groups and declare themselves as the protectorate of the non-Muslim communities of the empire. So it was the beginning of the Armenian problem.

Besides giving a general description of the conditions of the period and the foreign policies of the other powers, the author

also focused on the Ottoman policies towards the Armenians and the other minority groups in order to appease the interventionist states.

Öke, in the next chapter, reviewed how the Armenians were encouraged and propagated to rebel against the Ottomans in the East by support of great powers. He also examined the interests of great powers under supporting the Armenian separatist movement. He stated that such rebels would cause the allied powers to gain a strategic superiority over the Ottomans and the axis powers by reducing the strength of the Ottoman army during the war. Öke underlined the fact that the Armenian separatist movements were not just a struggle of getting their independence in the name of self-determination but was a policy followed by the great powers to accelerate the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. In other words, during the process of Armenian awakening the international factors were much more influential than the nationalist feelings.

In the third chapter, the author focused on how the Armenian problem had been solved until 1923. By the time the war was continuing, the circumstances had been changed. New powers emerged in the scene. In the East, the Bolshevik revolution took place and Tsarist Russia collapsed. Bolsheviks refused all Russian diplomacies and withdrew from the war. This was a very important step for the Kemalist movement because Bolsheviks were ready to give some concessions to Turkey in order to establish their legacy in the world.

On the other hand the allied powers, Britain, the US, France and Italy could not able to come to conclusion during the peace conferences. They did not exactly know how to share the Ottoman lands because some lands were promised to more than one power. For example the area of Kilikya was promised to French and the Armenians at the same time. Such conflicts enabled Turkish diplomacy to increase its capability of maneuvering. Armenian attempts to establish a Greater Armenia had never been realized because it was unacceptable for the interests of the Allies and Soviets. It became so clear that Armenians in the East, just like the Greeks in the West were only the actors of a war strategy designed by great powers.

Öke, in the conclusion part, tried to summarize the Armenian problem, which has been so far described in a detailed way in the

previous chapters. He highlighted how the Ottoman integration policy towards the existing subcultures of the Empire was based on the principles of respect and tolerance. The Ottoman state was able to manage the problems occurred within its foreign subjects without any serious attempts against the state until the introduction of nationalist ideas from the West. Although the Ottomans made so many adjustments in the status of the minorities, they could not keep their unity. The author finally concluded that the minority issue has always been a very sensitive issue in the history of the states and it has been used as means of propaganda and imperialist policies.

The author used a large number of primary and secondary sources as well as foreign archives and official documents. I guess using so many primary sources and foreign archives would satisfy the readers who have doubts about the credibility of the book. In addition to this, the footnotes can be very useful for a further research about the Armenian problem.

"SCHOLARSHIP FROM HELL"

Book's Name: **A PROBLEM FROM HELL: AMERICA AND THE AGE OF GENOCIDE**

Author: **Samantha POWER**. New York: Basic Books Publishing, 2002. 384 pages.

ISBN: 0465061508

Ercan KARAKOÇ* and Gökmen KILIÇOĞLU*

The author of "A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide", Samantha Power, is Executive Director of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. This book deals with "genocide" in the 20th Century and the American reactions to "genocide". The author's stated primary purpose in writing this book is to sensitize both the US government and people at large about the disparity between the great power of America and its government's inadequacy in intervening to stop genocide wherever it is occurring.

* Both are Research Assistants at Gebze Institute of Technology, Kocaeli.

In order to explain the term of "genocide", its historical background and meaning, Power chose a number of case studies beginning with the Armenian Relocation, then the Holocaust, Bosnia, Cambodia, Iraq and Rwanda. We will focus our comments and critique on the first chapter of the book called "Race Murder" that deals with the Ottoman - Armenian conflict during the First World War.

Although the author has a legal background it is immediately obvious that she does not have a sufficient grounding in history to tackle a subject as sensitive and controversial as the Ottoman - Armenian conflict, the Armenian revolutionary movements and subsequent relocation of 1915 and its historical interpretation. This point is highlighted by the fact that she begins her book in a totally out of context manner by lauding and praising an Armenian, Soghomon Tehlerian, who assassinated Talat Pasha, one of the leaders of the Ottoman Empire during First World War. The author's claim that the relocation of the Armenian people in the Ottoman Empire was "genocide" is presented as a fact and with very little research or clear evidence to prove this claim. Her bias continues as the chapter refers to no Turkish documents, nor to any objective scholars' and experts' books on this issue. For example, little to no reference can be found to the extensive work carried out by Professors Bernard Lewis, Stanford Shaw and Justin McCarthy. In addition, even though the foundations to her claims lies in a book by the former US Ambassador to Istanbul, Henry Morgenthau: "Ambassador Morgenthau's Story", she does not mention the critique of that book, "The Story Behind Ambassador Morgenthau's Story" written by Heath W. Lowry. In his book, Lowry shows that there are many discrepancies between Morgenthau's book and his diary, letters and reports that were sent to the State Department.

A number of crucial errors that need to be addressed can be found in the book. First of all, Power states that Talat Pasha ordered the roundup and execution of some 250 leading Armenian intellectuals in Istanbul.¹ However, what she does not include is the fact that many of them were members of terrorist organizations and that their arrests came as a direct result of their

¹ Power, Samantha; *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*, Basic Books Publishing, (New York, 2002), p. 2.

attempts to provoke the Armenian populace to revolt and commit terror against the Ottoman Empire.²

Another claim of the author is that Sultan Abdulhamid II killed 200,000 Armenians in 1895 - 96.³ Once again these numbers are more akin to fiction than fact because Armenian organizations themselves, such as the British-based Anglo-Armenian Committee and Evangelical Alliance, put that figure at 20.000.⁴ Furthermore, these events occurred during mass rebellions by Armenians in Eastern Anatolia where many Muslims were also killed. The author also mentions that 1,5 million Armenians were killed during these events and the relocation process. However, demographic studies prove that prior to World War I, fewer than 1,5 million Armenians lived in the entire Ottoman Empire. Thus, allegations that more than 1.5 million Armenians from Eastern Anatolia died are false. Justin McCarthy's book⁵ "The Population of Ottoman Anatolia and the End of the Empire" covers the whole era and proves beyond doubt that the Armenian population of the Empire as a whole did not exceed 1.3 million. Of this number, hundreds and thousands indeed left for other regions before and during World War I, especially to what was to become Armenia proper, according to estimates given even by Armenian sources, and those who reached their final destination of Ottoman Syria.

The third claim in Power's book is an anecdote in Morgenthau's Story where Talat Pasha allegedly asks Ambassador Morgenthau whether the United States could get the New York Life Insurance Company and Equitable Life of New York, which for years had done business with the Armenians, to send a complete list of the Armenian policyholders to the Turkish authorities. "They are practically all dead now and have left no heirs," Talat Pasha said. "The Government is the beneficiary now."⁶ However, Lowry has shown that no such conservation took place and that the only time Morgenthau discussed with Talat Pasha these insurance firms was on April 3, 1915. Lowry qualifies this by pointing out that these

² Göyünç, Nejat; "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Ermeniler Hakkında," in Hasan C. Guzel (edt.), *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ermeni Sorunu*, (Istanbul, Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2001), p. 47.

³ Power; *ibid*, p. 8.

⁴ Kuran, Ercüment; "Tarihte Türkler ve Ermeniler," in Hasan C. Güzel (ed.), *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ermeni Sorunu*, (Istanbul: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2001), p. 43.

⁵ McCarthy, Justin; *Muslims and Minorities: The Population of Ottoman Anatolia and the End of the Empire*, (New York, New York University Press, 1983).

⁶ Power, *ibid*, p. 8.

kinds of conversations and crucial meetings between Morgenthau and Talat Pasha were always reported to the State Department, but that in this case it was not.⁷ Lowry goes on to say that there are no documents in the US archives about such a conversation having ever taken place. Lowry, also adds that while Morgenthau was writing his book he was assisted by two Armenian colleagues, his secretary, Hagop S. Andonian and the legal adviser of the US Embassy, Arshag K. Schmavonian.⁸ As the Ambassador spoke no Turkish, French or Armenian, and did not travel outside of Istanbul, it can be suspected that their contributions have exceeded mere assistance.

The most significant omission made by Ms. Power is the well-documented massacre of defenceless Muslims (Turks, Kurds and other ethnic groups) by Armenians during the First World War. Mass graves of Muslims in Eastern Anatolia near towns such as Kars, Erzurum and Van, cities occupied by Armenian assisted Russian forces, are testimony of the carnage inflicted upon civilian populations by the alliance of Armenians and Russians.

As it is well known, in 1919, the British High Commission in Istanbul, utilizing Armenian informants, arrested 144 high Ottoman officials and deported them to the island of Malta to be out on trial on charges of a premeditated attempt to harm Armenians. While the deportees were interned in Malta, the British appointed an Armenian scholar Mr. Haig Khazarian, to conduct a thorough examination of the Ottoman, British⁹ and the US archives¹⁰ to substantiate the charges. Though he was granted complete access to all records, Khazarian's corps of investigators discovered no evidence to demonstrate that Ottoman officials had

⁷ Lowry, W. Heath; "The Story Behind the Ambassador Morgenthau's Story," (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1990), p. 40.

⁸ Lowry, *ibid*, p. 14, 15.

⁹ 29 July 1921; Foreign Office 371/6504/E8745: "The Charges made against the persons named in the Foreign Office list are of a quasi-political character, and are for this reason to be distinguished from those cases in which Turks have been held as prisoners of war on the advice of the Law Officers upon charges of cruelty to British Prisoners of War... Up to present no statements have been taken from witnesses who can depose to the truth of the charges made against the prisoners. It is indeed uncertain whether any witnesses can be found and it is hardly necessary to dwell upon the difficulty of finding witnesses in a country so remote and inaccessible as Armenia, especially after so long a lapse of time..."

¹⁰ R. C. Craigie, British Embassy in Washington, to Lord Curzon, 13 July 1921; Foreign Office 371/6504/8519: "I regret to inform your lordship that there was nothing therein which could be used as evidence against the Turks who are at present being detained at Malta... No concrete facts being given which could constitute satisfactory incriminating evidence... The reports in question do not appear in any case to contain evidence against these Turks which would be useful even for the purpose of corroborating information already in the possession of His Majesty's Government..."

either sanctioned or encouraged the killing of Armenians. After two years and four months of detention without trial, the British Procurator General exonerated and released all 144 detainees.

The author indicates in her book that in 1919 the Ottoman Government set up a tribunal in Istanbul that convicted two senior district officials for crimes committed against the Armenians and she hence concludes that by this action Ottomans had accepted the veracity of the Armenian Genocide claim.¹¹ However, as she mentions in her book, there were 320,000 British soldiers in Istanbul who were exerting pressure on the Ottoman Sultan and the Government to come up with results. The impartiality of such a court must be called into question. Yet, even if the proceedings of this Court were to be accepted it must be noted for the record that those persons who did not take sufficient measures to save and assist Armenians during the relocation were convicted, but that the Court did not accept the allegation of a plan to murder Armenians.¹²

In conclusion, although the author has a legal background, she blatantly plays prosecutor, judge and jury without giving the defendant a right of defence. She sentences the Turkish side to the high crime of genocide by omitting any Turkish point of view or that of other scholars, who do not subscribe to the Armenian orthodoxy, as regurgitated by Power, on this controversial issue. If one is going to level the crime of "genocide" against a nation, this ought to be done not by reaching out to hand-picking "evidence" and "scholars" to prove a pre-accepted verdict, but by looking at all available evidence and scholarship with an open mind and deciding whether it supports such an accusation. The duty of a scholar is to find and preserve the truth. It should not be to help perpetuate hate by disseminating bias as fact and outright lies as truth.

¹¹ Power, *ibid*, p. 14.

¹² Genelkurmay ATASE Arşivi, K 212, D 231 (in Cemalettin Taskiran; "Türk Ermeni İlişkileri, Tehcir Olayı ve Sözde Soykırım," Hasan C. Güzel (ed.), *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Ermeni Sorunu*, (Istanbul: Yeni Türkiye Yayınları, 2001), pp. 220, 221.

Book's Name: **SECRETS OF A "CHRISTIAN" TERRORIST STATE, ARMENIA**

Author: Samuel A. Weems, Retired State Attorney, Arkansas
St. John Press

Yüksel OKTAY

Finally, there is a book that tells the true nature of the Republic of Armenia, a small country east of Turkey, which claims to be the first "Christian" state in the world, and the activities of Armenian-Americans which the author characterizes as the "Armenian Colony in America". All this year, the Armenians have been celebrating the so called 1,700th anniversary of Armenia's acceptance of Christianity as the state religion, even hosting the ailing Pope, using his holiness in the perpetuation of one of their stories. As the 382 page book reveals, the creation of Armenia goes back only to the early 1800s, mostly on other people's land given to them by the Russians, and told to the unsuspecting world in their made up stories. In fact, the book is subtitled "The Armenian Great Deception series - Volume 1" and the author promises more books to come that will reveal the 'truth' about this.

Samuel Weems is a former district attorney and judge from Hazen, Arkansas. He has a juris doctorate degree from the University of Arkansas School of Law. In the Preface, the author reflects on his experiences in Turkey, including on September 11, 2001, and tells about the great affection and sympathy that Turks have towards the Americans and wishes that other people would have been in Turkey on that tragic day to witness it for themselves. Then he goes to the heart of the matter and states that he has uncovered facts that prove Armenian-Americans are spreading tall tales claiming a massacre and genocide in an effort to get mega-dollars out of both the Turks and American Christians to benefit their 150 year old "ancient" homeland.

The Turks and many scholars and historians have been telling the world that there was never a genocide against the Armenians ever since the Armenians started their smear campaign, which so far has fallen on deaf ears. Now the brilliantly told facts in Sam Weem's book should be an eye opener to the supporters of the so-called Armenian genocide. In the Preface, the author also gives details of the hate campaign directed towards him by the Armenian-American organizations and individuals since the

announcement of his book and lists other prominent Americans who have been the target as well, including Prof. Stanford Shaw, Prof. Heath Lowry, Prof. Justin McCarthy and film maker Robin Williams, who have had the courage to tell the truth.. What a shame, Americans against Americans.

In the Introduction, the author questions the beginnings of Armenia, and states that it was not until 1820 when the Czarist Russia attempted to expand its empire that the Armenians appeared on the world scene and started atrocities for creating a Greater Armenia in eastern Anatolia through terror and forced removal of the Muslim populations that came under their control. The Russians were the biggest enemy of the Turks for centuries starting many wars with the Ottomans and later, became the enemy of the Armenians as well, which is well documented in a story by one of the great Armenian-American authors from Fresno California, William Saroyan, called "Antranik of Armenia". This should be a must read for everyone after Sam's book to know what an Armenian whose parents migrated to the United States from Bitlis, Turkey has been telling the world about the Armenians, the Turks and the Russians.

The Holy terror of the Armenian Gregorian or Orthodox Church acting together with the state is chronicled throughout the book starting with Chapter 1, which also reveals the role of the Christian Missionaries in Anatolia beginning in the mid 1850's. The author even refers to statements made by Reverend Cyrus Hamlin, the founder of the Roberts College in Istanbul, and also the support given by Dr. George E. White, the President of Anatolia College in Merzifon, appearing before the King-Crane Commission in 1920 for the establishment of American Mandate over the remaining Ottoman lands after the First World War.

Throughout the book, the author presents excerpts from Professor Richard G. Hovannissian's four volume book "The Republic of Armenia" and challenges the validity of his statements. In chapter thirteen, the author tells how paid Armenian Agents molded public opinion in the United States and describes the activities of several commissions that were setup by the

US Government to look into the developments and the conditions in Turkey, such as the American Military Mission to Armenia, headed by James G. Harbord in 1919 and the King-Crane Commission in 1920. A wealth of information is provided

throughout the book about the findings of these commissions and also the false reports of Ambassador Henry Morgenthau .

One can easily understand why the United States Government did not recognize the Turkish Grand National Assembly which was established in April 1920 until 1927. There are also statements made by Admiral Bristol contradicting the findings of Henry Morgenthau, which is usually absent in books sympathetic to the Armenians..

In the final Chapter 21, the author writes about Armenia in today's world, the Karabakh problem, the establishment of a Turkish-Armenian Commission for Reconciliation and presents his 12 point suggestions that should be considered before the Turks can consider Armenian demands.

There are a small number of shortcomings of the book which I am sure the author will remedy with the next edition, such as including an index and a list of selected references and correcting several minor errors. As stated in the back cover, this book is a must-read for everyone who is interested in the establishment of good relations between the two neighbors following the motto of one of the greatest leaders of the twentieth century, Mustafa Kemal Ataturk, who the author speaks of with great admiration and respect throughout the book, "Peace at Home, Peace in the World".