



## Strong as Steel, Fragile as a Rose: A Turkish Jewish Witness to the Twentieth Century

Leyla Neyzi

Until recently, Jewish experience in modern Turkey attracted much less scholarly interest than the history of Jews in the Ottoman Empire. One of the many reasons for this is the reticence of the Turkish Jewish community to be in the public gaze. Only in the past decade or so have a history and an image of the community begun to emerge in the public sphere,<sup>1</sup> albeit cautiously, and they remain distinct from intracommunal discourse.

The emergence of Turkish Jewish voices and their representation in the public sphere parallel the quest for democratization and the growing interest in history, memory, and identity in Turkish society as a whole. This interest is linked to recent debates concerning the legacy of the Kemalist revolution and its implications for the meaning of Turkishness in the twenty-first century.<sup>2</sup> The status and experience of minorities play an important role in this debate.

The debates in the public sphere in Turkey, along with emerging interest globally in questions of identity and subjectivity, have produced a growing body of social science research on Turkey. One of the emerging growth areas is social history of the twentieth century, including oral history. Oral history can make an important contribution

---

Leyla Neyzi, "Strong as Steel, Fragile as a Rose: A Turkish Jewish Witness to the Twentieth Century," *Jewish Social Studies* 12, no. 1 (Fall 2005): 167–189

---

[168]

Jewish  
Social  
Studies

to debates on historical events that are highly contentious, or about which the historical record remains largely silent.<sup>3</sup> The subjective and presentist nature and narrative structure of oral history make it a useful means of studying how the past is understood, interpreted, and experienced by subjects in the present.<sup>4</sup> Oral historians have mined life history narratives to come to terms with the ambivalence, ambiguity, contradiction, and lack of cohesion that characterizes subjective experience and its articulation in everyday life.<sup>5</sup> Oral history is an invaluable tool in the study of national, communal, and subjective identity.

I begin this article with an overview of Jewish experience in the Ottoman Empire and the Turkish Republic. I will then discuss the oral history narrative and military journal of Yaşar Paker, born Haim Albukrek in 1896 in the Jewish neighborhood of the city of Ankara, a community that no longer exists. Paker was an important witness to life in the Jewish community of Ankara in the years leading up to its establishment as the capital of the new Turkish Republic. He was also witness to two important but little-known events in Ottoman/Turkish history: the experience of non-Muslim “soldiers” conscripted into labor battalions during the Turkish “War of Independence” (1919–22),<sup>6</sup> and this conscription again during World War II.

I was fortunate in that Paker shared with me the journal he kept during his experience as a soldier in 1921, and that he allowed me to interview him in 1997.<sup>7</sup> This has made it possible to compare a historical document with an oral history narrative recounted in the present. At the advanced age of 101, Paker said: “If I have lived until today, it is because I suffered so much. Suffering makes a person strong. Man is strong as steel, fragile as a rose.”

In my analysis of his oral history narrative, I suggest that Ankara functions as a trope for the traditional past that “enlightened” Jews came to reject. Paker’s depiction of his military experiences in both his journal and his oral account demonstrates the contradictory position of Turkish Jews between Christians and Muslims as well as their ambiguous and ambivalent relationship to Turkishness. Paker’s dual narratives exemplify the long-standing identification of Turkish Jews with modernity and reflect their unease with discourses of difference, at least in the public sphere. This contrasts with the rise of postmodernist discourses of identity and difference among other minorities in Turkey, such as the Kurds and the Alevis (a community of heterodox Muslims). Whether emerging representations of Turkish Jews will result in an analogous public discourse of difference remains to be seen.

## Jewish Experience in the Ottoman Empire

A distinguishing feature of the experience of Jews in Turkey is that, unlike in the West, they live in a Muslim (rather than a Christian) society where Jews and Christians have been historically classified as *gayrimüslim* (non-Muslim). The status of non-Muslims in Ottoman society was based on Islamic law, according to which *zimmi*s (non-Muslim Ottoman subjects) constituted a “protected” group.<sup>8</sup> Non-Muslim communities had considerable internal autonomy in return for the payment of taxes.<sup>9</sup>

The Jewish population was historically a small minority in the Ottoman Empire as compared to the larger Christian population. The Jews in the Ottoman domains constituted a highly diverse group in terms of origins, language, and culture, including Romaniot Jews, Italian Jews, Ashkenazi Jews, and Sephardic Jews, with the latter constituting the majority. In the mythology of Sephardic Turkish Jews, their acceptance by the Ottomans at a time of calamity—the exodus from Spain—plays a central role. Yet this also perpetuates a discourse of “tolerance” based on the relationship between “host” and “guest.” Eli Şaul refers to an expression that underscores this unequal and insecure relationship: “The Turk does not beat the Jew: What if he does?”<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, Jews in the Ottoman Empire tended to fare better than their counterparts in Christian Europe.<sup>11</sup>

Although the terms *zimmi* and *gayrimüslim* do not differentiate Jews from the Greek Orthodox or Armenians,<sup>12</sup> from the perspective of each of these communities the distinctions are crucial. Historically allying with the powers-that-be, in this case the Ottoman state, Jews tended to compete with Christians. During the sixteenth century, Ottoman Jews were at the height of their commercial success. In the seventeenth century, as European trade became more important, Christians began to replace Jews in commercial life. Greek Orthodox and Armenian communities, in particular, benefited from the capitulations and other agreements with the Western powers that gave them protected status. The rise of nationalist movements bolstered a discourse that opposed “loyal” Jews as against “treacherous” Christians.<sup>13</sup>

The Ottoman reform movement, which emerged from the eighteenth century, had as its goal the “saving of Empire.” The ideology of Ottomanism that marked the reform edicts of 1839 and 1856 had important consequences for non-Muslim communities. Due to a combination of pressures from Europe and the internalization of Enlightenment ideas by elites, these edicts decreed that all Ottoman subjects, regardless of religion, had equal rights and duties vis-à-vis the

[169]

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*

●  
Leyla Neyzi

[170]

Jewish  
Social  
Studies

state. This meant no less than the abolishment of zimmi status in favor of universal citizenship. At least on paper, these reforms abolished differences in clothing, residence, and taxation and made it possible for non-Muslims to attend state schools (and learn Turkish), serve in the military, act as witnesses, be represented on local councils, and work as government employees.

A modern conscription system in the Ottoman Empire can be dated back to the Gülhane Reform Decree of 1856.<sup>14</sup> According to this system, non-Muslims paid a military exemption tax. From the Second Constitutional Period (1908) onward, all able-bodied Ottoman (male) subjects were subject to conscription.<sup>15</sup> Although non-Muslims served as soldiers and officers in the Balkan Wars, distrust fueled by desertions and the mounting nationalism of the Young Turks meant that most were unarmed and served in labor battalions (*amele taburları*) used in road construction and transport behind the lines in World War I. This presumably provided the model for units of the same name during the Turkish War of Independence.

In the late Ottoman period, the Jewish community was split between traditionalists, modernists, and nationalists. In the mid-nineteenth century, a movement emerged in Europe, particularly among French Jews, the goal of which was to “emancipate” Eastern Jews.<sup>16</sup> Though based on Orientalist conceptions of “Eastern” society, it nevertheless led to the improvement of the lot of Ottoman Jews through the introduction of a modern educational system. Between 1860 and 1920, the Alliance Israélite Universelle established schools in Jewish communities throughout the Ottoman domains. The movement was initially resisted by traditionalists, but it succeeded in time in becoming the establishment itself. With the entry of Ottoman Jews into state and Alliance schools, a Jewish bourgeoisie gradually emerged.

The Alliance schools ensured that modernist discourse would be the dominant discourse of Ottoman/Turkish Jews; they also created (or enhanced) class divisions within the community—divisions expressed in linguistic form.<sup>17</sup> As non-Muslims who did not identify with nationalist activity centered in Anatolia, Turkish Jews have historically been at pains to represent themselves as loyal subjects. Represented in the Ottoman parliaments of 1877–78 and 1908–18, Jews were active in the Young Turk movement, some of whose Muslim leaders had been students in the Alliance schools. The Jewish community was divided: although a Zionist movement also emerged, many threw in their lot with the Young Turks, and later with the Kemalists.

By the time Turkey was occupied by the European powers at the end of World War I, nationalist campaigns had rent the Ottoman Em-

pire asunder. From 1919, a movement led by Mustafa Kemal, a former Ottoman officer, challenged the defunct Ottoman regime in occupied Istanbul by creating a national assembly in the central Anatolian town of Ankara and fighting war on three fronts: with the Armenians in the east, the French in the south, and the Greeks in the west.

The Greek army invaded western and northwestern Anatolia and Thrace in the summer of 1920. This offensive was forestalled at the First Battle of İnönü in January 1921. A second Greek offensive in late March 1921 ended with Turkish victory at the Second Battle of İnönü. A new Greek offensive in mid-July 1921 led to a Turkish retreat and invasion of the towns of Afyonkarahisar, Kütahya, and Eskişehir. The Greek advance led to a battle in which “the thunder of cannon was plainly heard in Ankara.”<sup>18</sup> Panic in the national assembly followed, with plans to move to Sivas if Ankara fell. The three-week fight ended in Turkish victory by September.

After widespread debate in parliament, the Ankara government decided on December 26, 1920, that non-Muslims would be conscripted.<sup>19</sup> On March 2, 1921, an order went out that labor battalions be formed. One of the main reasons for the formation of these units was to ensure that local non-Muslims (that is, Christians, particularly local Greeks) would leave their regions of origin and not join the forces fighting the Turks. At the time of conscription, arms belonging to these men were requisitioned, and they served without weapons or uniforms. It was thus a peculiar military experience: these “soldiers” were disarmed and prevented from mobilization by competing forces. The units were moved to eastern Turkey between late May and August 1921.<sup>20</sup> This was a crucial period in the course of the war. It was in July that the Turkish forces were forced to retreat—and only in mid-September 1921 that the Greek advance was forestalled. The battle that would result in the final defeat of the Greeks was fought in August 1922, leading the way to the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923.

### **Jewish Experience in the Turkish Republic**

Despite the radical rupture that the creation of a secular Republic represented, religion remained an important basis of identity in modern Turkey. The experience of Jews and Christians in the Turkish Republic was in part an outcome of Turkish memories of war that blamed the non-Muslims (and the Christians in particular) for the loss of Empire. Creating an independent national economy was identified with the replacement of foreign and local non-Muslim capital with Muslim/Turk-

[171]

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*



Leyla Neyzi

ish capital. Ultimately, non-Muslims in the Turkish Republic would be greatly reduced in numbers as the result of out-migration.

Although the history of Turkish Jews has largely been written in tandem with official history in Turkey, viewing Turkish Jewish history from within necessitates the establishment of quite a different chronology, including many events passed over in official accounts. Rifat Bali has outlined an alternative chronology, focusing on legislation and events targeting minorities in general and Jews in particular.<sup>21</sup> He mentions a media campaign in the 1920s targeting Jews, accusing them of taking over the role formerly played by Christians. Non-Muslim lawyers were expelled from the Turkish Bar Association. Restrictions were imposed on the movement of non-Muslims in Anatolia. In 1932, a new law prohibited persons holding foreign passports from working at certain jobs.<sup>22</sup> Following the centralization of education in 1924, Alliance schools were discontinued. In 1934, a law requiring all Turkish citizens to take Turkish surnames was passed.

As of 1933, when the Nazis took power in Germany, events that targeted Jews in particular began taking place. (Turkey managed to stay out of World War II, though relations with Germany were maintained throughout the war.) In 1934, the “Thrace incidents” occurred. Jewish communities had long been established in cities in Thrace, such as Edirne and Çanakkale. In that year, however, a boycott was started against Jewish traders in the region. Soon, assaults on Jewish property and Jewish families began, and whole communities were forced to flee. Although the public silence on the Thrace events has only recently been broken, it seems clear that these incidents were part of a government plan to empty areas close to the border of minorities for “security” reasons.<sup>23</sup> Another goal was to transfer Jewish capital and property to Muslims.

In 1941, when Turkey was facing the possibility of a German invasion, President İsmet İnönü (the second president of Turkey) ordered the creation of regiments composed of non-Muslims to be sent to rural Anatolia. During the first half of May, non-Muslim men of all ages were recruited off the streets of Istanbul and other cities and into the army.<sup>24</sup> Although rarely allowed to serve as officers, non-Muslims had usually been placed in mixed regiments in Republican Turkey. The creation of non-Muslim regiments created great anxiety, particularly among Jews.

In 1942, the İnönü government instituted the notorious Capital Levy, the goal of which was to tax those who had profited from the war economy. In practice, however, this head tax was applied in a discriminatory manner to ensure the large-scale transfer of capital from non-

Muslims to Muslims, particularly in the city of Istanbul. Those unable to pay were sent to a labor camp in eastern Turkey. Many families were ruined by the Capital Levy, which was one of the main reasons behind the large-scale migration to Israel with the establishment of the Israeli state in 1948.<sup>25</sup>

When the single-party regime in Turkey came to an end in 1946, the Jewish community began to feel more at ease. The populist policies of the Democratic Party meant greater freedom. Private enterprise was encouraged, non-Muslims were allowed to serve as officers in the army, a Jewish deputy served in parliament, religious education was permitted in minority schools, and Jewish newspapers were rapidly established. After the 1950s, the profile of Turkish Jews changed. Anatolian Jewish communities had largely disappeared. Families living in the historic Jewish neighborhoods of Istanbul, Izmir, and Ankara either immigrated to Israel or moved to newer mixed middle-class neighborhoods.

During the tensions between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus in 1955, the events of September 6–7 took place. Instigated by the government, gangs attacked minority-owned businesses in Istanbul. This resulted in another wave of immigration to Israel.

After 1980, as Islamism became a mass movement, antisemitism also increased. In the discourse of Islamists, Jews are at the center of a conspiracy that had resulted in the establishment of the Turkish Republic.<sup>26</sup> A new public discourse emerged within the Turkish Jewish community linked to attempts by the Turkish government to create a pro-Turkish lobby in the United States. In 1989, a Quintcentennial Foundation was established by leading Turkish Jews to publicly celebrate the 500th year of the Jews' exodus from Spain. This was an occasion to demonstrate to an international audience the "harmonious" relations between Muslims and Jews in Turkey. It resulted in a new, public presence of Turkish Jews in the media, albeit in a manner that conformed to official discourse.

Today, Turkish Jews mainly speak Turkish as their first language, give their children Turkish names, and resemble secular middle-class Turks in many ways. Young, educated Turkish Jews increasingly distinguish between modern and conservative persons, whether of Jewish or Muslim origin.<sup>27</sup> Vivet Kanetti, a journalist who writes novels in Turkish using a pseudonym, refers to modernity as symbolized by the French language: "Languages are very important, except for Spanish [Ladino]. They [the Turkish Jews] hated it and wanted to be modern as soon as possible. Ladino (Judeo-Espagnol) is not very fashionable; French is very fashionable and a means of social mobility."<sup>28</sup>

Turkish Jews express ambivalence about their Jewish identity, which

[173]

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*



Leyla Neyzi

they variously accept and deny.<sup>29</sup> Within the community itself, this identity is often expressed through a celebration of “the capacity for language, the fact that language becomes an elastic toy, [such as] Jewish jokes [and] the ability to narrate.”<sup>30</sup> Beki Bahar recalls evening gatherings during her childhood when families amused themselves by performing linguistic feats and telling stories and jokes.<sup>31</sup> Yet difference has remained a fact even for the most assimilated Jews. Intercommunal marriage continues to be discouraged because it threatens a community that is already shrinking due to out-migration. Assimilation itself may be read as a form of self-protection through public invisibility. Şaul notes that parents taught their children Turkish (and gave them Turkish names) to ensure invisibility in the public domain, for language was a sign of difference.<sup>32</sup> According to Riva Kastoryano, the Jewish community continues to operate sociologically as “an association with 25,000 members, with a life-style that resembles a ghetto.”<sup>33</sup> Jews continue to view Turks as “the owners of the land” and to keep their distance. Kanetti writes of “the great distance felt toward other people by Jews. They are referred to as ‘them’ and ‘the greens’; one speaks with a better Turkish, one lowers one’s voice.”<sup>34</sup> This insularity and fear also means that it is difficult for individuals within the community to express alternative views—the oligarchic structure of community leadership being a legacy of the centralization associated with the establishment of the Chief Rabbinate in 1835.

### **Hacendi: A Historic Jewish Neighborhood**

The Hacendi neighborhood in Ankara was one of the oldest Jewish communities in Turkey.<sup>35</sup> The history of the city goes back to antiquity, and a well-established Jewish community in Ankara existed in Roman times. Romaniot, Ashkenazi, and Sephardi Jews coexisted in the neighborhood and gradually mixed. As in the rest of the Ottoman Empire, the Jews of Ankara flourished in the early Ottoman centuries but declined in economic wealth and power in comparison to Christians after the seventeenth century. Western travelers in the nineteenth century noted the underdevelopment and poverty of the Jewish neighborhood, which was a typical Ottoman Jewish neighborhood with its synagogue, Talmud Tora school, public bath, and public fountains.

Because the Jewish community in Ankara was deemed to be too small, an Alliance school was not established here. However, the community was indirectly influenced by the Jewish Enlightenment through the appointment of schoolteachers educated in Alliance



schools. Bahar mentions that a boys' school resembling an Alliance school was established in Ankara in 1889, and that David Kasado was the second headmaster of this school.<sup>36</sup>

As in the rest of the Ottoman domains, out-migration of Jews from Ankara began during the late Ottoman wars. Despite continuous out-migration during the twentieth century, there was a slight increase in the Jewish population when the city flourished in the years following the establishment of the Republic. The Jews of Ankara supported the Kemalist movement, and parliamentarians would board in Jewish homes in the 1920s. As Ankara developed, Jews increasingly moved out of the community into new middle-class neighborhoods. Migration increased after the establishment of Israel. Today, there are no Jews living in the Hacendi neighborhood.

### **Paker's Ankara**

In the summer of 1997, when I interviewed Paker, he claimed he was the sole Turkish Jew still living in the historic Jewish neighborhood of Galata in Istanbul. Paker had moved to Istanbul as a young man during the 1920s. He was, however, born and raised in the Jewish neighborhood of Hacendi in Ankara. In his life-story narrative, Paker spoke at length about his childhood and youth there, a city that played a central role in one of the most turbulent periods in recent Turkish history: the fall of the Ottoman Empire and the establishment of the Turkish Republic.

Paker still had in his possession his father's account book that recorded his birth date according to the Hebrew calendar and his name in the Hebrew Rashi script. His original surname, Albukrek (or Albuquerque), derived from the town from which his ancestors originated on the Iberian Peninsula.<sup>37</sup> He chose to change his name to Yaşar Paker in 1934, when last names became mandatory by law and citizens of Turkey were "encouraged" to take Turkish names.

Paker's father owned a small fabric shop. He and his wife were cousins, which was common in the small Jewish community where everyone knew one another and most people were related. Paker's maternal grandmother was a midwife, one of the few occupations available to women at the time. Although little in the way of material culture survived among the Sephardi families in Ankara, their most important heritage was their language, which was based on fifteenth-century Spanish. In his narrative, Paker recalled the songs in Judeo-Spanish sung by his mother as well as during festive occasions such as weddings.

[175]

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*



Leyla Neyzi

The acceptance of Jews by the Ottomans following their expulsion from Spain remains a cornerstone of Turkish Jewish identity. Acknowledging this mythic beginning, Paker nevertheless critiqued the Ottoman system based on religious difference: “When the Jews came from Spain, the Ottoman Sultan made things easy for us—but he didn’t want us to mix with Muslims. A Jew was to be recognized on sight. Neighborhoods and schools were separate, as if we belonged to different countries.” This perspective, as I show below, is rooted in a modernism that associates difference with inequality.

During Paker’s childhood, his paternal grandfather married for a second time, moving with his new family to Jerusalem in his old age. (As Paker explained to me during the course of the interview, Jews aspired to end their days in the holy city of Jerusalem.) But when Paker’s father became seriously ill, the grandfather was forced to return. He hoped to train both Paker and Paker’s sister’s fiancé so that they could run the family shop. But the fiancé, the father, and the grandfather all died in the difficult years of the first decade of the twentieth century. Paker was left on his own to maintain the household, which now included his mother and three siblings.

Ankara operates as a central trope in Paker’s life-story narrative; it represents the traditional past against which both Alliance and Kemalist discourse positioned themselves. This is how Paker depicted pre-Republican Ankara: “At that time, Turkey was viewed as the most backward country in the world. Ankara was the most backward province of Turkey. And the most backward community in Ankara was the Jewish community.”

Paker’s description of the community in Ankara at the beginning of the twentieth century uncannily resembled a portrait of “Eastern Jews” in a 1840 report by a French commission:

During the lifetime of my grandfather, there was no train in Ankara. Traders received their goods by camel caravan. Since they were largely illiterate, each trader had his own sign, which he used to identify his goods. My grandfather’s sign was two criss-crossing lines drawn inside a rectangle. When I was a child, the streets of Ankara were narrow, and the wooden houses had no running water, no electricity, no telephone. Shops didn’t even have windowpanes. Our women wore baggy pants, and did their wash in public fountains in the street. Going visiting at night, a man would lead with a light, with the women following behind. Until the time of Atatürk, there was nothing in Ankara at all.<sup>38</sup>

Paker described his father and grandfather as conservative men. Speaking of a photograph of his father, whom he hardly knew, he noted:

In my father's time, it was considered a sin to have your photograph taken. My father was on the school board. When David Kasado became headmaster, they wanted to take a photograph at the school. You can tell from the picture that it was taken against his will. My father's bow tie is crooked; they must have used force!

[177]

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*

●  
Leyla Neyzi

Turkish nationalist discourse has tended to contrast the non-Muslim bourgeoisie with the Muslim masses in the late Ottoman period. Paker, however, carefully distinguished in his narrative between Christians and Jews. According to him, the Jews of Ankara, who were mostly petty traders like his father, were located *between* the economically powerful Christians and the largely non-commercial Muslims. In his account, then, the category non-Muslim was identified primarily with Christians, who were set off from *both* Muslims and Jews: "There were many Greek Orthodox [*Rum*] and Armenians in Ankara. Commerce was in their hands. The marketplace was closed on Sundays. You couldn't even buy a handkerchief if you wanted."

As a child, Paker attended the Ravzai-i Terakki school located next to the historic synagogue. He described the transformation of this school under the influence of a schoolteacher trained by the Alliance:

At the age of six or seven, I went to school, where they taught us simple prayers in Hebrew. But when I was eight, they brought a new headmaster from Istanbul. David Kasado was responsible for a revolution in Ankara.<sup>39</sup> Not just in school, but in the whole community. Until then, it was worship from morning until night. He turned the school into a real school, dividing the children into classrooms and enforcing a serious curriculum that included the teaching of French. Because we were so backward, he found schooling in the daytime insufficient: we [also] attended school at night, torches in hand. Girls used to come to school wearing baggy pants [*salvar*] and sandals [*nahn*]. He interfered with everything, including women's clothes. He helped the community immensely.

Paker recounted an event that occurred during his schooldays that marked him deeply, making him resist a discourse of difference for the inequalities it can produce:

At that time, we didn't have summer vacation. Instead, each class would take turns taking a day off during the week. On our holiday, my class went for a picnic along the riverside. As we settled down to eat, a group of Muslim children appeared. Upon seeing us, they began to throw stones. Abandoning our food, we started to run, arriving in our neighborhood with the boys close on our heels. What a life that was! Whoever was stronger would dominate the other. Children would play freely in [their own] neighbor-

[178]

Jewish  
Social  
Studies

hood, but once they entered a Greek, Armenian, or Muslim neighborhood, they would be stoned. Difference is horrible. I remember dreaming of ways to protect myself from those children. I wanted to have a kind of dress from which needles would emerge whenever anyone touched me. There was so much fear.

Paker's discourse provides a contrast to today's postmodernist discourse of difference, demonstrating the influence of Enlightenment views. This anecdote also shows the tension between Christian, Jewish, and Muslim communities at a time of rising nationalism and anticipates the violence that would come to pass during the Turkish War of Independence.

After only a year in Kasado's school, Paker was forced to give up his education. He recalled the progressive schoolmaster pleading with his grandfather to keep him in school. But his grandfather was an old-fashioned man who believed a boy should learn his trade by working.<sup>40</sup> Paker remembered that he himself was not too anxious to stay in school:

I didn't want my grandfather to accept either. I was so ignorant—I viewed going to school as a calamity. In those days, a child who finished school would distribute sweets, as if he had managed to escape from hell. There were beatings in school—it was like prison.

Here Paker, as the narrator of his life story speaking in the present, commented on what he viewed as his previous, "unenlightened" self living in a traditional, "unenlightened" community.

For Paker, the Ankara of his childhood symbolized everything about the past that he wished to overcome. This is why he chose to leave Ankara as a young man, though he realized in retrospect that he could have benefited from the city's efflorescence in the early Republican era. Most of all, he wanted to get away from the conservative and insular Jewish community.

Paker's narrative is centered on a transformation in which his youthful self sheds an earlier identity and embraces a new one:

As a child, I was very religious. People's ideas change. Let me tell you how I have changed. Until I was 20 years old, I was very conservative. Every Saturday, I would go to the synagogue. In the synagogue, there is a cupboard where the Old Testament is kept. Several oil lamps are placed in front of this cupboard. In one of these lamps, I saw an angel. Just as I see you in front of me today. Then it flew away. I was going to the synagogue but I didn't know Hebrew. I later found the French translation of the prayers I was memorizing. When I understood the meaning, then I changed.<sup>41</sup>

As one of the distinct influences on his transformation, Paker cited—in addition to Kasado’s school—his friendships with Greek and Armenian youth, which provided a link to a cultural life outside the insular world of the Jewish community:

[179]

After I left school, I made friends with some Greek and Armenian boys. I was the only one to do so. These friends left during World War I. I never saw them again. They used to invite me to dances. We would get together and dance until morning. There were no tapes in those days. Two of us would sit down and play. The others would dance. Then two of the dancers would play, and the musicians would dance. Polka, mazurka, quadrille! In this way, I became less shy and more sociable. But some elderly ladies came to my mother and said, “What is your son doing? Does this behavior benefit our family?”

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*

●  
Leyla Neyzi

Another important influence on Paker were the foreigners exiled to Ankara from Istanbul during World War I.<sup>42</sup> Paker referred to these people as *sosyete*, meaning “high society.” He was affected in particular by several Russian intellectuals who lived in Ankara for a short time:

During World War I, I had a shop in Ankara. Exiles would arrive in Ankara from among our enemies: French, English, Russian. These people would come to my shop, and we would get acquainted. They were looking for a place to meet, so I suggested my house. Within six months, enormous accomplishments had been achieved. An orchestra was formed. I began to learn French and to take violin lessons. There were debates in French in the evenings. Once a week, a dance took place. We gave concerts and theater performances. We performed a play by Molière in which I also acted.

For Paker, these Westerners represented a world of culture and civilization from which he felt increasingly deprived. Ironically, in the quote above, Paker referred to these foreigners as “our enemies”—that is, enemies of the Ottomans. But in the rest of his account, he largely identified with these “enemies” who represent a civilization he longed to be part of.<sup>43</sup>

According to Paker, his links to a world outside the Jewish community created a yearning for another sort of life: “Thanks to those exiles, I realized how behind I was. It is due to them that I changed. When the war ended, they all left. Then I found myself in limbo and didn’t want to remain in Ankara.” Yet he was also forced to take care of his family and to make ends meet in times of war, poverty, and social disorder. Forced to close his father’s shop during World War I, he worked for a time as an employee in another shop. Later, having settled all his siblings, he decided to move to Istanbul. Paker said that another reason

[180]

Jewish  
Social  
Studies

for coming to Istanbul had to do with marriage. He claimed that he was pressured to marry the daughter of the leader of the Jewish community in Ankara; his refusal provided additional impetus to leave.

In his life-story narrative, Paker recounts an intriguing incident that occurred during his youth. For a time, his family had rented a room to a Frenchman. After this man had returned to France with the outbreak of World War I, the family found that he had left behind a box full of Western-style hats. According to Paker, this discovery made them fearful. They lost no time in burning the hats to cinders. This anecdote is significant given the symbolism of headgear at the time. Until 1925, local men wore the Turkish fez, European-style hats being associated with the West. At the time of the establishment of the Republic, local non-Muslims were routinely accused of wearing European hats during the Allied occupation—the hat being viewed as a sign of collaborationism. Yet the fez also represented the Ottoman (Muslim) past that the Kemalist regime would come to oppose. Despite strong local feeling against Western headgear, with the Hat Reform of 1925, Kemal forced the Turkish people to give up the fez as a step in the direction of modernity.

#### **A Turkish Jewish “Soldier” in the Labor Battalions During the Turkish War of Independence**

In telling his life story, like many men of modest means, Paker felt his military experiences to be the most noteworthy.<sup>44</sup> And here Paker was certainly justified, since, as mentioned above, he was witness to two important events in the history of the military in Turkey: the conscription of non-Muslims into labor battalions during the Turkish War of Independence and again during World War II.

As the minutes of the secret sessions of the Turkish Parliament show, the conscription of local non-Muslims was much debated at the time.<sup>45</sup> In his life-story narrative, Paker gives us a glimpse of the ways in which ordinary people hear of what takes place in the corridors of power. According to Paker, a young man by the name of Halid, who worked in the grocer’s shop next door (and who was known for his ability to write fast), became employed as a scribe in parliament. It was from Halid, privy to the secret debates taking place there, that Paker first heard that a law would be passed to conscript non-Muslims.

In his oral account, Paker claimed that around this time it was suggested to him that he marry the daughter of the leader of the Jewish community of Ankara. Despite the fact that his potential father-in-law

might have made his exemption from the military possible, he chose to serve in the army. Paker represented himself as a victim of misfortune who resisted by facing the challenge, rather than taking the easy way out:

The enemy had come as close as Haymana [a town near Ankara]. Earlier, non-Muslims did not serve in the army. Then, a law was passed according to which they would be conscripted. An exemption tax could be paid. But my capital was small. Because of this, I said to my brother and mother, "Let me go, this war will not last long. If the situation is difficult, I will send a telegram and you can pay the tax."

In his narrative, Paker provided a description of his first experience in the military:

Because I was non-Muslim, they gave me neither firearms nor a uniform. We were sent to build roads between Kastamonu and Inebolu [towns in the Black Sea region]. In those days, there was no train. We got to Kastamonu on foot. I was very lucky. I was assigned to work with the doctor. But when the enemy got close to Ankara, the danger increased. If Ankara fell, so would Kastamonu. Upon receiving new orders, we set out on foot toward Erzurum [a town in eastern Turkey]. We were each given four loaves of bread and a cone full of black olives. When we suddenly left in this way, I sent a telegraph to Ankara asking my family to pay the exemption tax. After walking on foot for 32 days, the order for my release arrived in Erzincan [a town in eastern Turkey]. What we suffered until reaching Ankara!

What is particularly significant about Paker's first military experience is that he kept a journal at the time. Thus, in addition to Paker's oral history account, we have access to a contemporary historical document. Paker's journal was written during a turning point in the Turkish War of Independence, when the outcome of the war was far from certain.

Paker's military journal, written by hand in French in a small notebook, begins on March 31, 1921, when he is recruited, and ends six months later on October 2, 1921, when he arrives back in Ankara. In his oral account, Paker stated that his goal in keeping a journal was to practice French: "I was trying to learn French. So every day, I wrote down the names of the places we stayed in. I wrote how every day passed." The use of French and the act of keeping a journal in the European fashion indicate the influence of the modernization movement among Ottoman Jews.

Paker wrote in his journal almost every day. Most of the entries de-

[181]

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*

●  
Leyla Neyzi

[182]

Jewish  
Social  
Studies

scribe the route, the natural environment, and the towns his unit passed through, as well as accommodation and food insofar as these were available. In many ways, life was reduced to its most basic tenets: to be able to walk, to find food and shelter. While Paker depicts the terrible material conditions under which soldiers were forced to live, he rarely makes reference to the war or to the more negative personal experiences he undoubtedly had. The journal is significant as much for what it says as for what it remains silent about. As I will show below, this is where a comparison with his oral history narrative becomes important.

On July 10, Paker makes one of the few direct critiques of the military in his journal:

I have learned a great deal during my military service, particularly from the psychological point of view: porters [and] lazy and miserable men are more respected. Those of the lowest classes become sergeants and corporals, especially those that smoke hashish [*esrar*]. You should see with what pride these people order you around, how they glorify themselves, be-thinking themselves pashas.

Overall, though, while describing the difficult material conditions and the negative treatment the soldiers sometimes received at the hands of their superiors, Paker displays an attitude of patience and stoicism. On April 4, after describing that they had to sleep on the floor with only their coats for cover, he writes, "I have no complaints against anyone; on the contrary, I say to myself, all right, one must get used to it." On June 29, after he was put to work as a laborer, he writes, "It's been 15 days since I've been working and I feel a thousand times better because the exercise improves my appetite and gives me renewed energy." On July 10 he writes:

How delicate I was in Angora. . . . I meticulously followed [the rules of] hygiene, if the window was open a little bit I feared becoming ill. This life has changed that: sleeping on the ground, having no other cover than a coat, eating with coarse men from the same pot, dirt and misery all around. Yet I have not become ill, on the contrary, I am better than I ever was. And I am even better off because I've learned to suffer, or, rather, I no longer fear misery. I've become more able to fight, and I even envy those who work breaking stones. I am not pleased that I am better regarded. I ask myself sometimes if there is no greater suffering than this. I feel that I would like to suffer more, to get to know greater suffering.

In his journal, Paker represents his experience as a personal trial or challenge. He tells a version of a classic quest story in which the hero leaves home to face adversity, only to return a transformed man. The



construction of a discursive account of his experience gives Paker a sense of control, turning victim into hero. On August 22 he notes, "Yesterday I thought I couldn't take another step. Yet today I feel better than yesterday and this gives me patience. In the face of misfortune, man becomes strong as steel."

Although Paker viewed the journal as a means of recording his experience, he was also keenly conscious of the need for silence. In his oral account, Paker told an anecdote that he had not recorded in his military journal, and that he was wary of telling decades later:

I am going to tell you something but don't publish it in the newspaper. Going along the road toward Erzurum, we were passing through some villages. Seeing us, the women there assumed we were going to war. So they began to cry, saying, "My boy!" But when the gendarme who was accompanying us said to them, "Don't cry. These are infidels [*gavur*]," the same women who had been crying began to insult and to stone us.

Intriguingly, and possibly due to the fact that his interlocutor was of Turkish/Muslim background, Paker follows this anecdote with a statement in which he justifies the government's actions, making a distinction between "loyal" Jews and Christian "traitors":

Our situation was terrible. But the government was right. For there was no security at all. Outside, there was the enemy. But the enemy inside was even worse. If Haymana fell, all of us soldiers would become the enemy of the government. This was true, but we poor Jews had no problems with the government at all! But could they make a separate law for four Jews? When they said "Non-Muslim," we had to go too.

In his journal, Paker uses humor, fantasy, nostalgia, and irony as means of coping with the traumatic present. Conscripted at the beginning of April, he refers to this as an "April's Fool." Humor and fantasy become intertwined as Paker and his comrades create a fantasy world, remember the past, or try to imagine a positive future. Sometimes his dreams concern the future. On July 27 he writes:

Let's say I was free for example, what would I do? I feel a desire to go to Constantinople. My resolution is taken: as soon as I am free, I will leave Angora. I want to find a more civilized environment. It's true that I will face many obstacles, but nothing will stop my will to act. In any case don't I suffer already? Military service has taught me to suffer and many other things.

At this time of war and trauma, the boundaries of belonging were ever in flux. Paker's journal demonstrates the multiple allegiances and

[183]

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*

●  
Leyla Neyzi

[184] Jewish Social Studies

contradictory position of Jews in Ottoman society. The use of pronouns in the text is particularly indicative of this. On the night of August 15, at the point when Paker thinks the guards were preparing to fire on brigands, he identifies with the guards as “we.” But when he learns that his fellow soldiers have escaped and that they are the brigands he imagined, he realizes that he himself is a possible target for the guards, whose “other” he represents at the moment.

### **A Turkish Jewish “Soldier” During World War II**

Although rarely allowed to serve as officers, non-Muslims were usually recruited into mixed regiments in Republican Turkey. In 1941, at a time when Turkey faced the possibility of a German invasion, President İnönü ordered the formation of labor battalions made up exclusively of non-Muslims. These battalions were sent to different parts of Anatolia, where they worked as laborers. This is when Paker became a soldier again.

Intriguingly, Paker’s account of his second military service in his oral history narrative also began with a story of (non-) marriage. Telling the story this way allowed Paker to represent himself as an actor, someone with choices, rather than as the victim that he was. This time, the year is 1941, and he is 45 years old:

One day, my mother cried because I was still unmarried. I promised her that I would marry. At that time, a girl was suggested to us through an intermediary. She worked as a cashier in a shop in Beyoğlu [a cosmopolitan neighborhood in Istanbul]. I went and saw her, finding her attractive. We met at the home of a relative, and made the necessary arrangements. It seems that she owned a house as part of her trousseau. It didn’t matter to me in any case—it was on my mother’s account that I accepted. We planned to go out together the following Sunday. Can you believe the next day President İsmet İnönü gave the order for 20 divisions to be formed from among the non-Muslims? Gendarmeries were checking everyone’s identity cards on the streets. If they saw that you were non-Muslim, they would immediately take you away. Ads were placed in newspapers calling upon non-Muslims to enlist. It was then that I sent word, saying that I had become a soldier. I did not want to keep her under obligation—only God knew if I would return.

In his account of his second military service, Paker criticized men who used their fiancée as a source of food and other amenities. He depicted himself as poor and modest but nevertheless proud and self-sufficient.<sup>46</sup>

Paker's second military experience resembled the first in that he was in a unit composed solely of non-Muslims, working on road construction. One important difference was that, though they were still not given firearms, they were given uniforms in 1941. Paker made a point of mentioning this at the beginning of his account: "During my second military service they gave us uniforms."

The conditions in which the men recruited in 1941 did their military service were very bad. Invariably, they were sent to inhospitable rural areas, where many became ill. Paker recalled his experience:

At first, all the non-Muslims were sent to Afyon [a town in western Turkey]. From there, we were distributed to different places. I was sent to Çivril, which is in Denizli [a town in western Turkey]. We made it to Çivril, which consists of a vast plain. In need of water, we began to use the only well that was available. Then, illness began. Out of 500 people, 50 were left. Everyone else became ill. There was only one doctor in Çivril. Of the fourteen people in our tent, only myself and a shopkeeper named Eskenaz were all right. Everyone else became ill.

Paker once again represented himself as a victim who nevertheless managed to survive:

I see that everyone is breaking stones. But four people only are living a great life. Their job is to take the unit to work in the morning with music. I thought to myself, I used to play the violin when I was young. There was a musician who led that group of musicians called Yetvart Margosyan. He was a great musician. We became friends. He advised me to get an instrument and to practice on my own. In this way, I joined the music group and was freed of breaking stones.

In discussing his second military experience, Paker was more openly critical of government policy, possibly since, under the Republic, non-Muslims normally served in mixed units. Paker's narrative expressed the ambivalence Turkish Jews felt about President İnönü, who created the labor battalions and instituted the Capital Levy. However, Paker maintained the position that any problems existing between the state and the minorities concerned the Christians, not the Jews. He also acknowledged the fact that İnönü kept Turkey out of the war, which meant that Turkish Jews were spared the horrific experiences of Jews living in countries invaded by Nazi Germany:

İnönü is the one who recruited 20 divisions of soldiers from among the non-Muslims. Isn't this strange? If we had entered the war, he could recruit equally from all communities. But we do not enter the war. And he

[185]

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*

●  
Leyla Neyzi

[186]

Jewish  
Social  
Studies

doesn't recruit from among the Muslims. Just from the non-Muslims. How strange! Now let's speak openly. We have the right. There is enmity between Muslim and non-Muslim. But there is none with the Jews. We are caught in the cross-fire. But İnönü kept us out of the war. We are very grateful.

### **Turkish Jewish Identity: Past and Present**

Paker's depictions of his military experiences in his journal and in his oral history narrative underscore the positioning of Turkish Jews between Christians and Muslims, and their corresponding ambiguous and ambivalent relationship to Turkishness. While referring obliquely to inequality and discrimination against minorities in Turkey, Paker nevertheless insists on the possibility of a secular society based on equality between citizens.

Today, minority communities in Turkey are increasingly developing postmodernist public discourses of difference.<sup>47</sup> In contrast, at least in public, Turkish Jewish identity remains wedded to modernity, allied to Turkish secularists who feel besieged by Islamic fundamentalism. The few autobiographies that are openly critical of the Turkish regime's policy toward Jews are relatively recent and have been written by authors who reside in Israel.<sup>48</sup>

Further research is needed on the public and private discourses and experiences of Turkish Jews. Certainly, the ongoing process of democratization, the outcome of the country's application for membership in the European Union, and Turkey's changing role in the Middle East are factors that will influence the representation of Turkish Jews in the public sphere in the near future.

### **Notes**

- 1 Stella Ovardia, *Kentte Gözükmek ve Saklanmak* (To Be Seen and to Hide in the City) (Istanbul, 1996).
- 2 Sibel Bozdoğan and Reşat Kasaba, eds., *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey* (Seattle, 1997).
- 3 Urvashi Butalia, *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of India* (Durham, N.C., 2000).
- 4 Alessandro Portelli, *The Battle of Valle Giulia: Oral History and the Art of Dialogue* (Madison, Wisc., 1997).
- 5 Elinor Ochs and Lisa Capps, *Living Narrative: Creating Lives in Everyday Storytelling* (Cambridge, Mass., 2001).
- 6 The Kemalists' struggle against foreign invasion, the Ottoman

government, and local dissent became known as “The War of Independence” after its success, which ensured the Kemalists absolute control of the new Turkish Republic.

7 My interview with Paker took place on May 30 and July 4, 1997. The translations from the original Turkish of the interviews are mine.

8 Gülnihal Bozkurt, *Alman-İngiliz Belgelerinin ve Siyasi Gelişmelerin Işığında Gayrimüslim Osmanlı Vatandaşlarının Hukuki Durumu (1839–1914)* (The Legal Status of non-Muslim Ottoman Citizens in Light of German-English Documents and Political Developments) (Ankara, 1996).

9 Zimmis living in Muslim society were restricted in certain ways, however. They could not marry Muslim women or act as witnesses against Muslims. They were required to wear clothing that marked their status and to refrain from wearing ostentatious clothes. They could not carry firearms or ride horses. They were discouraged from living in Muslim neighborhoods. Zimmis had to practice their religion with discretion and to get permission to build or repair churches or synagogues. For a discussion of the extent to which these rules were enforced, see M. Pınar Emiralioğlu, “Osmanlıda Müslim Gayrimüslim İlişkileri Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler” (Some Reflections on Muslim-non-Muslim Relations in the Ottoman Empire), *Kebikeç* 10 (2000): 75–88.

10 Eli Şaul, *Balat’tan Bat-Yam’a*

(From Balat to Bat-Yam) (Istanbul, 1999), 59.

11 Esther Benbassa and Aron Rodrigue, *Sephardi Jewry: A History of the Judeo-Spanish Community, 14th–20th Centuries* (Berkeley, 2000).

12 In a debate on the Internet, some writers have suggested that the category zimmi is most closely associated with Christians, Jews often being separately referred to as *Yehudi* (Debate on Turkish Studies Association/H-Net List for Turkish and Ottoman History and Culture, January 2001, www.h-net.org/~turk/).

13 In 1893, Sultan Abdülhamit II even considered creating a Jewish regiment from among the Russian Jews who sought refuge in the Ottoman Empire.

14 Erik Jan Zürcher, “Ottoman Labor Battalions in World War I,” Turkology Update Leiden Project Working Papers Archive, Department of Turkish Studies, Universiteit Leiden, Mar. 2002, www.let.leidenuniv.nl/tcimo/tulp/Research/ejz14.htm.

15 Ufuk Gülsoy, *Osmanlı Gayrimüslimlerinin Askerlik Serüveni* (The Military Adventure of Ottoman non-Muslims) (Istanbul, 2000).

16 Aron Rodrigue, *French Jews, Turkish Jews: The Alliance Israélite Universelle and the Politics of Jewish Schooling in Turkey, 1860–1925* (Bloomington, Ind., 1990).

17 Mahir Şaul, “The Mother Tongue of the Polyglot: Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism Among the Sephardim of Istanbul,” *Anthropological Linguistics* 25 (1983): 326–58. The rift between upper-class French speak-

[187]

*A Turkish Jewish  
Witness to the  
20th Century*

●  
Leyla Neyzi

[188]

Jewish  
Social  
Studies

- ers and lower-class Ladino speakers would provide the basis for the Zionist challenge to the establishment during the Allied occupation. See Nissim Ben-ezra, *Une enfance juive à Istanbul, 1911–1929* (Istanbul, 1996).
- 18 Stanford Shaw and Ezel Kural Shaw, *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass., 1977), 361.
- 19 *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Gizli Celse Zabıtları* (Records of the Secret Meetings of the Turkish Parliament) (Ankara, 1920–21).
- 20 Mustafa Balcıoğlu, *Belgelerle Milli Mücadele Srasında Anadolu'da Ayaklanmalar ve Merkez Ordusu* (Documents on Uprisings and the Central Army During the War of Independence in Anatolia) (Ankara, 1991).
- 21 Rıfat Bali, *Bir Türkleştirme Serüveni: Cumhuriyet Yıllarında Türkiye Yahudileri 1923–1945* (An Adventure of Turkification: Turkey's Jews in the Republican Years) (Istanbul, 1999).
- 22 From 1926 to 1965, the law on the hiring of government employees stipulated that all government employees be Turkish. See *Rıdvan Akar, Aşkale Yolcuları: Varlık Vergisi ve Çalışma Kampları* (Passengers to Aşkale: The Capital Levy and the Labor Camps) (Istanbul, 1999).
- 23 It is hardly a coincidence that the Thrace events occurred at the same time as the passing of a Settlement Law that gave the government widespread powers to move populations as part of its policy of Turkification (the Kurdish population in eastern Turkey being the main target).
- 24 In his memoirs, Vitali Hakko recalls being taken into the army the day after he had completed his military service. See Vitali Hakko, *Hayatım Vakko* (Istanbul, 1997).
- 25 It was more common for poorer, Ladino speakers to immigrate to Israel than the French-speaking bourgeoisie. Beki Bahar tells the story of the proverbial mother-in-law who, while attending her son's wedding in Israel, discovers that the bride is the daughter of her former servant. See Beki Bahar, *Ordan Burdan: Altmış Yılın Ardından* (From Here and There, After Sixty Years) (Istanbul, 1995), 40.
- 26 Islamists claim that Kemal Atatürk, who was raised in Salonica, belonged to the Sabbatean community, a group of Jews who outwardly converted to Islam in the seventeenth century, following their messiah, Sabbatai Sevi. See Leyla Neyzi, "Remembering to Forget: Sabbateanism, National Identity and Subjectivity in Turkey," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 44 (2002) 1: 137–58.
- 27 Melin Levent Yuna, *Identity Construction: Self-Narration of Educated Turkish Jewish Young Adults*. (Master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, 1999).
- 28 E. Emine, *Bizans Sohbetleri* (Byzantine Conversations) (Istanbul, 1988), 80.
- 29 Stella Ovidia, "Çeviri Hayatlar" (Translated Lives), *Defter* 11 (1990): 17–19.
- 30 Emine, *Bizans Sohbetleri*, 83.
- 31 Beki Behar, *Ordan Burdan*, 184.
- 32 Şaul, "Mother Tongue of the Polyglot."

- 33 Riva Kastoryano, "From Millet to Community: The Jews of Istanbul," in *Ottoman and Turkish Jewry: Community and Leadership*, ed. Aron Rodrigue (Bloomington, Ind., 1992), 254.
- 34 Emine, *Bizans*.
- 35 Beki Bahar, *Efsaneden Tarihe Ankara Yahudileri* (Ankara's Jews from Legend to History) (Istanbul, 2003).
- 36 *Ibid.*, 57.
- 37 In her book on the Jews of Ankara, Beki Bahar refers to the Albukrek family. See Behar, *Efsaneden Tarihe*, 171–75.
- 38 According to this report, Ottoman Jews were isolated from the rest of society, led by traditional rabbis who were very powerful, did not educate their children, did not know European languages, married young, and believed in the devil and angels. See Rodrigue, *French Jews, Turkish Jews*, 10.
- 39 According to Paker, "the revolution set off by Atatürk" was the most important event of the twentieth century. It is no coincidence that Paker uses the term "revolution" when speaking of both David Kasado and Mustafa Kemal. For him, what Kasado tried to accomplish for the Jewish community in Ankara, Kemal accomplished for the country as a whole.
- 40 In his autobiography, writing about the first two decades of the twentieth century, Benezra contrasts Turkish Jews, whose main foci he claims were religion and trade, with East European Jews, who valued education above all. See Benezra, *Une enfance juive*, 160.
- 41 It is hardly a coincidence that language plays a central role in Paker's narrative of transformation. With the establishment of the Alliance schools, the French language came to represent Enlightenment values.
- 42 The experiences of foreign nationals exiled from Istanbul to Anatolia during World War I (and World War II) constitute an episode in Turkish history that deserves further study.
- 43 Paker's fractured subjectivity in this passage is not unlike that of Turkish elites who were themselves torn between decrying European imperialism and celebrating Enlightenment values.
- 44 Leslie Gill, "Creating Citizens, Making Men: The Military and Masculinity in Bolivia," *Cultural Anthropology* 12 (1999): 527–50.
- 45 *Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi Gizli Celse Zabıtları*.
- 46 In her autobiography, Bahar notes that engagements sometimes lasted for years in those days, with men often breaking off their attachments after long periods of separation due to military service (Bahar, *Ordan Burdan*, 39).
- 47 Hakan Yavuz, "Media Identities for Alevis and Kurds in Turkey," in *New Media in the Muslim World: The Emerging Public Sphere*, ed. D. Eickelman and J. Anderson (Bloomington, Ind., 1999).
- 48 For a recent example, see Erol Haker, *Istanbul'dan Kudüs'e Bir Kimlik Arayışı* (A Search for Identity from Istanbul to Jerusalem) (Istanbul, 2004).

[189]

*A Turkish Jewish Witness to the 20th Century*

●  
Leyla Neyzi