

this common enemy is the pillar of Armenians' solidarity, reinforced by their fight to have the Turks recognize the Genocide. Ironically, in the voice of Baron Baghdassarian, a respected member of Anoush Tree, Shafak suggests,

[S]ome among the Armenians in the diaspora would never want the Turks to recognize the genocide.²⁹ If they do so, they'll pull the rug out from under our feet and take the strongest bond that unites us. Just like the Turks have been in the habit of denying their wrongdoing, the Armenians have been in the habit of savoring the cocoon of victimhood. Apparently, there are some old habits that need to be changed on both sides. (p. 263)

Armanoush is hooked into this cyberspace and constantly enriched by the knowledge exchanged there. With this knowledge, and with the urge to confront a Turk,

A few times she had tried to converse with [her stepfather Mustafa] about 1915 and what the Turks had done to the Armenians. "I don't know much about those things," Mustafa had replied, shutting her out with a genteel but

²⁹ I should note here, parenthetically, that after a close reading of Shafak's novel, it struck me why she was accused of insulting Turkishness and tried under Article 301 of the Turkish Penal Code. The prosecutors must have latched on to the use of the "G word" (regardless of the fact, or perhaps even unaware of the fact that it was uttered by a Diasporan Armenian character and not by the author/narrator). The book, in my opinion, is a balanced comparison of the Armenian and Turkish points of view. It does not reinforce the Armenian cause more than it reiterates the Turkish side of the story. It does not emphasize the persistence of the Turks in their indifference toward the past and unwillingness to face it, more than it underlines, on many occasions, the Armenians living in the past and denying themselves the opportunities of the future.