

## *Zionism in South Africa* *An Historical Perspective*

In the comparative perspective of Diaspora Jewish communities, especially in English-speaking countries, the distinctive, perhaps even unique, attributes of South African Zionism lie in its hegemony in Jewish communal life and its centrality for Jewish identity. Indeed, Herzl's famous exhortation that Zionism "conquer the communities" was fulfilled in the South African case to a truly remarkable degree. There can be no doubt that judged by almost any criterion — membership, fundraising capacity, press resources, political vitality, or youth affiliates — the Zionist Organization has always been the pre-eminent institution in the life of the community.

### *Hegemony of Zionism*

From the outset, Zionism functioned in South Africa within the unified organizational framework of the Zionist Federation which not only coordinated the activities of all Zionist societies and groups, but also acted as an initiating authority. The contrast with the position in North American Zionism may serve to illustrate the singularity of the South African movement.<sup>1</sup> In the U.S. and Canada, the existence of organizations with federative pretensions such as the Zionist Organization of America or the Zionist Organization of Canada never managed to encompass all Zionist societies and political groups. Moreover, whereas in South Africa fundraising developed within the Zionist Federation's orbit, in the United States it evolved independently of the Zionist Organization. Thus the United Jewish Appeal in America is today linked to funding of local needs whereas in South Africa the equivalent Israel United Appeal (IUA) is scrupulously separated from local needs and remains under the aegis of the Zionist Federation.

---

Gideon Shimoni is lecturer in Contemporary Jewry at The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. This article forms part of a book on the relationship between South African Jewry and Israel, edited by Harold Blumberg, to be published during 1980 by Turtledove Press, Ramat Gan. A major work by Dr. Shimoni entitled *Jews and Zionism: The South African Experience 1910-1967* is shortly to be published by Oxford University Press.

To be sure, synagogue congregations and various traditional benevolent and *Chevrá-Kadisha* societies preceded Zionist societies in the communal evolution of South African Jewry. But it is a fact of considerable significance that the first Jewish institution to achieve a national organizational framework was the South African Zionist Federation, formed in 1898.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, in the circumstances which obtained after the Anglo-Boer War, that Federation became, *de facto*, the first representative institution of the community vis-a-vis the governmental authorities. Its president at that time was Samuel Goldreich, who exerted a profound formative influence on South African Zionism.

For Goldreich, Zionism was not just one movement or stream among others in Jewish life. Zionism was synonymous with Judaism; it was Judaism at its best. "We dare not forget," he averred, "that nothing which concerns the Jew is foreign to us. The South African Zionist Federation is charged with the proper care of the local aspects of the Jewish question." In his view these aspects ranged from synagogue affairs to immigration and naturalization matters. "We have deserved the name that has been bestowed on us by the Zionist Congress... 'the Jewish Consulate in South Africa,'" he declared.<sup>3</sup> In consonance with this conception of Zionism Goldreich persuaded the High Commissioner, Lord Milner, to recognize the South African Zionist Federation as the appropriate agency to facilitate permits for the return of Jews who had fled from the Transvaal during the Anglo-Boer War. The wide range of activity of a strictly local, communal nature which

flowed from this task created important precedents for the hegemony of Zionism in the South African community. The Federation kept a strict lookout over incidents of antisemitism and threats to Jewish rights. It even defended Jews wrongly accused of illegal liquor trading, and arranged prayer *minyanim*.<sup>4</sup>

Indeed, it was only after a struggle, and with grave reservations, that the Zionist leaders permitted the establishment in 1906 of an overall representative organization in the form of the Jewish Board of Deputies, modeled on the body of that name in London. When the idea was first mooted at a public meeting in April 1903, Yiddish-speaking Zionists deliberately attempted to disrupt the meeting by booing and shouting. An English-speaking observer reported that the proposal "gave rise to noisy interruptions on the part of the alien [i.e., new immigrant] Zionist element and from this point onward this element became unmanageable....The expressed intention of the Zionist opposition was to stifle everything that was not under the direct and absolute control of Mr. S. Goldreich, as President of the Zionist Federation."<sup>5</sup> The Zionists argued thus:

Zionist organisations have direct and specific instructions from Vienna to watch and safe-guard Jewish political interests. Zionists are instructed to take part in all Jewish work and to care for all Jewish interests, in order to accustom governments to regard them as the representatives of the Jewish people. The establishment of other associations to deal specifically with the safe-guarding of Jewish political interests is thus not compatible with the policy of the Federation.<sup>6</sup>

Owing to all these activities the Zionist

Federation commanded a considerable adherence among South African Jews, who numbered some 40,000 by 1905. At its first Conference held that year, no less than 75 delegates attended, representing societies in every part of the country, from Cape Town in the south to Bulawayo, Rhodesia, in the north. By 1910 it embraced well over 60 Zionist societies within its framework.<sup>7</sup>

From that time onward the record of Zionist membership has remained extraordinary, especially when viewed in the comparative perspective of Jewries in the Anglo-American world. In mid-1946, when the first postwar Zionist election took place, South African Jewry as a whole numbered 104,156 Jews. No less than 39,945 were *shekel* holders and of these 28,876 cast their votes. Two years after the creation of the State of Israel, out of a population of 110,000 Jews, 50,000 adults were *shekel* holders.<sup>8</sup> As recently as 1971, after Zionist membership all over the world had undergone a drastic decline, 36,000 out of a total population of 118,000 Jews were enrolled as formal members of the Zionist Organization in South Africa. In the elections held that year, 16,763 people voted, representing 27.93% of the estimated adult Jewish population.<sup>9</sup>

Even after the Zionist leaders had become reconciled to the *theoretical* primacy of the Board of Deputies as a representative umbrella organization incorporating the Zionist Federation, they zealously watched over Zionism's *actual* hegemony in the community. In practice, the Zionist Federation was always the more powerful of the two bodies. It enjoyed unflagging public support and

was, in general, financially sound, whereas the Board of Deputies was chronically short of financial resources.<sup>10</sup> Only after 1933 did the Board's financial position begin to improve; the acknowledged need to counteract rising antisemitism gave it a new lease on public support. Throughout the years of their coexistence the Zionist Federation was able to exert its influence constitutionally, from within the Board, through its own representatives as well as through the deputies of other Jewish institutions who happened also to be Zionists. The Board of Deputies on the other hand, lacked internal leverage in the Federation. Thus Jack Alexander, who as Secretary-General of the Zionist Federation was a key figure in Zionism, sat on the Board's Executive from 1921 onward, with only a few years' break. Whenever Alexander sensed a digression from the Zionist line he sounded the alarm at the Zionist Federation. As he later recollected, "when we became really concerned about the way the Board was going... we decided to get more Zionists onto the Executive."<sup>11</sup>

An instructive incident bearing on the relationship of power between the Board and the Federation occurred in 1942. It concerned the objects of a War Victims Fund which the Board of Deputies had initiated. The Board had intended that this fund's purposes include helping South African Jewish families that had suffered as a result of the war as well as rehabilitating Jewish survivors of the war in Europe. The Zionist Federation insisted that the Fund must acknowledge the absolute primacy of Palestine in the reconstruction of Jewish life. This principle was accepted, but

only after a stormy debate in the Board during which some Yiddishists condemned the Zionists for attempting to dominate the Fund.<sup>12</sup> Thereupon, the Zionist Federation charged the Board of Deputies' Executive with lukewarmness toward Zionism on the mere grounds that they had permitted the Zionist demand to be questioned. How dared they allow the pivotal concept of a Jewish National Home to be classed simply as *one* of a number of rival political theories for the Jewish future?<sup>13</sup>

In the controversy which ensued, and which was resolved only when the Zionist Federation felt satisfied that the Board had been brought back into line, the Zionists issued a manifesto of principles which stated quite plainly:

We have to make it clear to those who do not yet appreciate it, that Zionism is not just one of a number of "parties" in Jewish life, but that Zionism is the positive survival policy for Jewry in its entirety....And it is in terms of a Zionist framework that the blueprint of Jewish life in South Africa must be developed.<sup>14</sup>

There was, in fact, little of importance in the life of the South African Jewish community which could be carried out without the support of the Zionists. Jewish education was a case in point. Although the Zionist Federation never created a school system of its own, it was an indispensable factor in the creation of a Board of Jewish Education when such a body belatedly emerged in 1928. From the outset, the ideological premises of Jewish education were essentially Zionist. During the 1940s these premises came to be formulated as "Jewish education based on broadly national-traditional lines."<sup>15</sup> This for-

mula was the result of a compromise between two main pressure groups within the Board of Jewish Education, both of which were Zionist — the Mizrahi Party on the one hand, and Zionists belonging to other political groupings within the Zionist Federation on the other. In educational practice the "traditional" facet of the formula aimed to expose the pupil to a modicum of observance and knowledge of basic texts, concepts, rituals and values of orthodox Judaism, while the "national" facet aimed at fostering identification with the Jewish national revival epitomized by the Zionist Movement and Israel. After 1948, when the Board of Jewish Education began to develop a network of day schools in South Africa, this "national-traditional" formula continued to be its ideological basis. Today these day schools encompass some 35% of the school-going population.

The funding of these day schools has been a persistent dilemma of South African Zionism. Unaided by the state, those responsible for the day schools have constantly appealed, not without a Zionist rationale, to the Federation's leadership to use part of Zionist-raised funds for the support of the schools. Opinion has been deeply divided on this point among Zionists — some claiming that aside from *aliyah* itself, day schools are the foremost Zionist imperative; others asserting that it would be a travesty of Zionism if IUA funds were to be diverted for local needs. In 1961 the matter was investigated by two Commissions of Inquiry into Hebrew Education, one for the Cape under Judge Herbstein, and the other for the rest of the country under Judge Kuper. Although both

Herbstein and Kuper were leading Zionists their commissions arrived at contradictory conclusions, the latter's recommending the use of IUA funds to help extricate the Board of Education from its financial difficulties, and the former's negating the idea.<sup>16</sup> Only in recent years has the inexorable demand for significant support of the constantly growing day schools at last obtained the Zionist Federation's agreement and the Jewish Agency's blessing.

### *Zionism as a Mode of Jewish Identity*

The second striking attribute of South African Zionism is its role as a normative mode of identity for South African Jews. In other English-speaking countries such as Britain and the United States, the Jew normatively perceived himself as a member of a religious group, and only with reservations, if at all, as a member of a distinctive national group. In contrast, South African Jews have always perceived themselves at least as much in terms of national belonging as of religious belonging. It was Zionism which mediated this self-perception.<sup>17</sup>

In the United States and in Britain, Zionism confronted influential and widespread anti-Zionist ideological positions drawing upon two basic kinds of objection: first, that Zionism was theologically wrong because, as the ultra-Orthodox charged, it contradicted messianic eschatology or, as Reform Judaism charged, it ran contrary to the sacred mission of dispersion. Second, that it corroborated the antisemitic charge of dual loyalty thereby gravely

endangering the achievement of full emancipation for the Jews. Consequently, native modes of American Zionism were heavily preoccupied with proving that Zionism was not incompatible with acculturation and membership in the American nation. They tended to de-emphasize or modify the basic Zionist proposition that the Jews are a separate nation and instead, to stress the religious, humanitarian proposition that all Jews should help in the upbuilding of Palestine as a haven for oppressed Jews and as a spiritual center for all of Jewry. In order to advance the Zionist approach, Louis Brandeis, for example, set about proving that the ideals of Zionism were compatible with "progressivist" American ideals; hence to be a good American one had to be a good Jew and to be a good Jew one had to be a good Zionist.<sup>18</sup>

In South Africa this rationale was redundant. Jews, by and large, regarded it as axiomatic that, first they were an entity not only of religious but also of national character, and, second, the restoration of *their* national homeland in Palestine was indisputably the foremost Jewish task of their time. The only anti-Zionist position of any durability was of the Yiddishist variety which itself recognized the first part of this axiom even if it rejected the second part. No Jewish group of significance ever contended that acknowledgment of the national attributes of Jewry was incompatible with being a South African.

Ironically, it was in South Africa that these assumptions were sorely put to the test after the creation of the State of Israel. Israel's expanding relations with independent African states and its at-

tendant escalating opposition to apartheid in the international forum precipitated a crisis for South African Zionism which lasted throughout the 1960s. A reaction of widespread bitterness toward Israel developed among white South Africans. Israel's behavior was described as a "stab in the back"; charges of Jewish dual loyalty were made in the pro-Government press and the Government imposed a punitive stoppage of transfer facilities for Zionist-raised funds. Indeed, Prime Minister Verwoerd himself voiced intimidating innuendoes when he said that the attitude taken up by Israel was "a tragedy" for Jewry in South Africa because it was liable to stimulate local antisemitism.<sup>19</sup>

These were highly disquieting years for South African Jews. Yet anyone examining the historical record cannot fail to be impressed by the firmness with which the Zionist leadership refused to be held accountable for the acts of the Israeli Government and insisted that to deny the Jew his special association with Israel was tantamount to denying him expression of his Jewish identity. Zionist spokesmen repeatedly declared that irrespective of the Israeli Government's foreign policies, "no Jew worthy of the name will deny his deep attachment to Israel," and that "South African Jews could not be expected to abandon their bonds with the Jewish people and its rebirth in the land of their fathers."<sup>20</sup>

By thus tenaciously upholding its Zionist convictions the leadership of South African Zionism was able to retain its hold on an acutely disturbed and perplexed Jewish public. Jews continued to contribute generously to Zionist funds in anticipation of a time when the South

African Government might again permit their transfer to the Jewish Agency in Israel. In the wake of the Six Day War of 1967 and the deterioration of relations between African states and Israel, the South African Government finally suspended its ban on transfers and the climate of white South African opinion reverted to its former sympathy for Israel.

Of crucial significance in promoting the Zionist mode of Jewish identity were the youth movements. Whereas in other Western countries, particularly in the United States, some major youth organizations were fostered by non-Zionist community agencies such as synagogue federations, in South Africa the Zionist movement virtually monopolized all youth activity. By 1920 there were already thirty-three "Young Israel Societies," as the first youth groups were called, affiliated to the Zionist Federation.<sup>21</sup> Their membership was of the 18 to 25 years age group. In 1931 the first uniformed junior youth movement, *Habonim*, was founded to cater to the 10- to 15-year age group. By 1948 the Zionist youth movements had multiplied on the basis of political alignments and included the Revisionist youth movement *Betar*, the *chalutz* (pioneering) oriented youth movement *Hashomer Hatzair*, and youth movements affiliated with *Mizrachi* (the religious Zionist Party), the Zionist Socialist Party and the General Zionist Party. It may be estimated that during the 1950s and 1960s an average of some 30% of the 10- to 17-year age group were members of youth movements.<sup>22</sup> The ubiquitous influence of these youth movements has had the

significant effect of exposing successive generations of South African born Jewish youth to a mode of Jewish identification determined exclusively by Zionism. In consequence, to this very day South Africa is one of the few countries in the world in which Zionist youth movements have retained their strength and remain a vibrant and influential factor in the life of the community as well as a steady source of *aliyah*.

### *The Historical Explanation*

What is the historical explanation for these special attributes of South African Zionism? Two major factors may be singled out: one is the remarkably homogeneous character of the Jewish immigration to South Africa and the other is the dualistic character of South African White society of which the Jews have always been a part.

The homogeneous character of the community results from the preponderance of immigrants from one region of Eastern Europe in the period after 1880; the region known traditionally as *Lita* (Lithuania). There is evidence to indicate that, at a conservative estimate, at least 70% of the Jewish immigrants to South Africa came from this area, and particularly from one part of it, the province of Kovno. South African Jewry has thus, with some justification, been called a "colony of Lithuania."<sup>23</sup>

These immigrants came to South Africa between 1880 and 1930, when the Quota Act virtually put a stop to their entry.<sup>24</sup> Most had already been exposed to Zionism before leaving *Lita*.

Many had become adherents of the Movement, initially of *Hovevei Zion*, later of the many streams of politicized Zionism ranging from *Zeirei Zion* to Revisionist Zionism. These immigrants to South Africa thus brought Zionism with them as part of their spiritual baggage. Moreover, they entered at the foundation level of the communal structure which was emerging. In contrast to the position in the United States, they were not confronted by an established communal structure, founded and led by Central European Jewish immigrants and shaped in conformity with the assumptions of denationalized Reform Judaism. In fact, Reform Judaism emerged in South Africa only as late as 1933, and then its founder and guiding mentor was Rabbi Cyrus Moses Weiler, who had himself belonged to the nonconformist minority of Zionists at Hebrew Union College. Not only were his Zionist credentials unimpeachable, but he was to provide an outstanding personal example of Zionist conviction by settling in Israel.

Yet the significance of South African Jewry as "a colony of Lithuania" ought not to be exaggerated. At least as significant a factor was the societal environment into which the Jewish immigrants entered. South African society has always been stratified by caste-like divisions between peoples of different color — its peculiar polity has aptly been described as a "pigmentocracy."<sup>25</sup> Of course, the Jewish immigrants to South Africa entered, from the outset, as part of the privileged White caste. But the White caste was itself culturally dualistic and of inchoate national identity. This was bound to have a distinctly

moderating effect on the degree of acculturation demanded of the Jew by the White consensus.

To be sure, the Jews certainly have acculturated into White South African society, but it has been overwhelmingly its English segment which has served as their reference group. Consequently, the pull of acculturation, with its attendant erosion of distinctive Jewish cultural identity, was considerably weaker than in England itself, where English culture was indigenous and unchallenged. Nor was it as strong as in the United States where a new, overarching American identity exerted a powerful acculturating magnetism. There was in fact no agreed South African identity equivalent to that provided by the concept of being "British" or being "American."<sup>26</sup>

The Afrikaner, for his part, did not expect the Jew to become an Afrikaner; indeed the organic nature of Afrikaner nationalism has always excluded the possibility. At the same time he did not wish the Jew to constitute an accretion of strength to the English group. Hence considerable leeway remained for the Jew to retain his distinctive identity not only in its religious sense but also in its national sense.

In balance, this peculiar dualism of White South African society may well be the profounder part of the explanation for the Zionist proclivity of South African Jewry. For we ought not to overlook the fact that Lithuania, particularly Vilna, was the cradle not only of Zionism but also of the socialist *Yiddisher Arbeiter Bund*. Moreover, it is an oft-overlooked fact that South African Jewry was itself not totally devoid of anti-Zionist strains. An ex-

amination of the historical record reveals their presence at a number of stages in the history of the community, mainly in the form of various Yiddish-speaking, radical-leftist groups. Examples are the *Yiddisher Arbeiter Club*, which existed from 1929 to 1948; the *Yiddisher Literarisher Farein* established in 1922, and the *Afrikaner Geserd* which functioned in the 1930s.<sup>27</sup> The significant point is not that the ideological baggage brought to South Africa by the *Litvak* immigration was entirely devoid of anti-Zionism, but rather that in the South African environment, neither the socio-economic development of the Jewish population itself, nor the Jewish national identification pattern which the white society encouraged in Jews, were favorable to leftist anti-Zionism. It therefore was rendered weak and ephemeral.

Furthermore, there is the significant fact that even the Anglo-Jews, i.e., those who had reached South Africa having been born in England or first been acculturated in English society, embraced Zionism at the very outset. It must be borne in mind that, although by the turn of the 20th century more than half of the estimated 24,000 Jews in South Africa were East Europeans, there were also some 7,000 Anglo-Jews at the least, and about 3,000 more who hailed originally from Germany but who, in many cases, had lived in England for a time before coming to South Africa.<sup>28</sup> In marked contrast to the equivalent acculturated Jews of the United States, Britain, and even Australia, who generally opposed early Zionism, in South Africa these "western" Jews rallied to Zionism and in fact provided its leadership echelon until



the late 1920s. The most notable figures were Maurice Abrahams, the first President of the Zionist Federation; S. Lennox Loewe, Hyman Morris, Samuel Goldreich and Leopold Kessler. It was only in the 1930s that Jews born in Lithuania took over the reins of leadership; men such as Lazar Braudo, Joseph Janower, Jacob Gitlin, Benzion Hersch, and Nicolai Kirschner. The fact that the acculturated Anglo-Jews found Zionism so acceptable points to the societal context; to its conduciveness to the expression of Jewish identity in national as well as in religious terms.

The translation of this sociological observation into historical data can be illustrated by much documentation reflecting legitimization of Zionism and sympathy for it in the eyes of Afrikaners. The following is a striking example: in 1920 an election notice issued by the Afrikaner nationalists in the *Transvaal* appealed to the Jewish vote in these terms:

There is no question that on sentimental grounds alone our ideals of nationalism should make the strongest appeal to all true Jews, since it has been the Jews more perhaps than any other race, who have demonstrated to the world that it is possible by sheer tenacity of purpose for a people, under the most adverse conditions, to preserve its traditions, its religion, even its language.

What have all your great leaders been from Moses to Esrah, and Nehemiah and Judas Maccabaeas and Chajim Weizmann, but great heroes battling for the preservation of your nation? Our struggle is the same in principle as yours. All we desire is to establish on a firm basis, as in your case you desire to do in Palestine... our nationality in South Africa. As we desire it for ourselves, so we would never

oppose you in your legitimate aspirations...<sup>29</sup>

Of course, the attitude of the extreme Afrikaner nationalists led by Dr. Malan changed radically between about 1933 and their ultimate election victory in 1948. In these years antisemitism made deep inroads into the Afrikaner national movement. This trend expressed itself not alone in agitation against any further Jewish immigration but also in blatant advocacy of a policy of unequal treatment in the form of occupational quotas for Jews already in the country.<sup>30</sup> In effect, however, the antisemitic agitation of the 1930s strengthened the Zionist orientation of South African Jews. By demonstrating the ubiquitous presence of antisemitism not only in Europe but even at home in South Africa, it provided, for the first time, a significant negative reinforcement for the Zionist ideology of South African Jews. As a contemporary Zionist pamphlet, written by David Dunskey, stated:

As in every country in the world, hatred of Jews has always existed in South Africa. ...Lately...external forces have so combined that the antisemitic movement has undergone a period of rapid growth and has become an alarming menace to South Africa and to its Jewish citizens. What can we, the Jewish citizens of South Africa, do about it?... Above everything else... the success of the Zionist movement — the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine — will mark the beginning of the end of antisemitic movements all over the world including South Africa...<sup>31</sup>

Moreover, irritating as the antisemitic aspersions on Zionism were, they could not undermine its legitimacy because they represented only the

avowedly antisemitic, opposition sector of the population. It was the conciliatory South Africanism of the ruling United Party of J.B.M. Hertzog and J.C. Smuts that provided the Jew's frame of reference for what was, and what was not, legitimate. Thus South African Jews could confidently answer Dr. Malan's charges in the following vein:

Dr. Malan has broken fresh ground by being the first South African politician with any claim to responsibility ever to have stigmatised the Zionist movement as evidence of the disloyalty or, as he puts it, unassimilability of the Jews....We are proud of our citizenship of South Africa; we love our country; we are as ready as any of our fellow-citizens to make every effort and every sacrifice for it; but we affirm... that we need not and shall not, on that account, give up the traditions and the ideals and the ties of kinship and common sentiment and aspiration which we have inherited from our forefathers and which we hold dear. If this be unassimilability then we are unassimilable.<sup>32</sup>

There is nothing more illustrative of the peculiar conduciveness of the South African societal environment to the cultivation of Zionism than the attitude of Jan Christiaan Smuts, one of the greatest gentile pro-Zionists of all time. Smuts had an ardent, Christian-rooted belief in the historic justice of the Zionist cause and a genuine admiration for the way in which the Jews had reconciled their national survival with their international dispersion. As he expressed it in one of many pro-Zionist speeches:

You have not been absorbed, you have not been merged and you have not lost your identity, but through all tribulations and persecutions, through all the vicissitudes of human history, you have survived...

and the day will come when the words of the Prophets will become true and Israel will return to its own land.<sup>33</sup>

Smuts' contribution to World Zionism had a far-reaching impact on South African Zionism. A reciprocal process was involved — he imparted strength and legitimacy to the movement while the leaders of South African Zionism stimulated him to advocate the cause on the international scene. Hence his celebrated role in the passing of the Balfour Declaration and, thereafter, his close friendship with Weizmann and valuable contribution to Zionism as the longest living, and most consistent, witness to the Zionist interpretation of the Balfour Declaration.

Few, if any, Zionist organizations in the world enjoyed legitimization, support, and encouragement such as the influential personality of Smuts bestowed on South African Jewry. Smuts candidly stated that he disliked non-Zionist Jews who tried to crack the wall of pro-Zionist solidarity. Indeed he often performed the function of prime fundraiser for the Zionist cause. He did not hesitate to state publicly that "if he were a Jew this was the cause for which he would put his hand in his pocket." He took distinct pride in the fine Zionist record of South African Jews. When he visited America in 1930 he told a gathering of the Zionist Organization of America:

I come from a little country where the Zionist movement is very strong. There may be doubts and misgivings or even a difference of opinion in other parts of the world over this great cause. In South Africa there is none. In South Africa all Jews are Zionists and the Christians are pro-Zionists....It is a very remarkable fact which nobody knows, and therefore should

be publicly stated, that next to the United States, the country which makes the greatest contributions to the cause of Zionism is South Africa.<sup>34</sup>

Zionism as a mode of Jewish identity was thus consensually legitimate in South Africa. At best it was regarded as fully compatible with Smuts' ideal of a conciliatory South Africanism; at worst, it was taken for granted by those Afrikaner nationalists who assumed that the Jews were indeed an alien nation which could not be assimilated. It so happened that attainment of the Zionist goal of Jewish statehood in 1948 was almost exactly contemporaneous with the attainment of political power by Afrikaner nationalism in South Africa. This convergence removed what might have become an obstacle to the traditional consensual recognition of Zionism. For the internal political considerations that were already modifying the antisemitic attitudes of extreme Afrikaner nationalists were now reinforced by the relief they felt at the solution which the Jewish State promised to provide for the "Jewish immigration danger." At the same time, the growth of Afrikaner sympathy for the Jewish struggle against Britain in Palestine facilitated a process of reconciliation.<sup>35</sup>

Once in power, Dr. Malan determined to put an end to Afrikaner concern with "the Jewish Question." He adopted a friendly attitude to Israel, permitted South African Zionists to continue their aid for Israel, and even visited Israel in 1953. The Afrikaners' sympathy for Israel increased with the years. Genuine admiration for Israel's achievements was compounded by a growing identification with Israel's geo-political situation as a

bastion of western democracy in a hostile Communist-backed environment. Comparisons with South Africa's position in Africa became common in the Afrikaans press, sometimes mistaking similarities in the geo-political situation for identity of social purposes in the two societies.<sup>36</sup>

Against this background, Israel's anti-apartheid statements and votes at the United Nations in the 1960s were perceived as highly ungracious and offensive acts. The result was the very disquieting period for South African Zionism to which we referred earlier. But the restoration of increasingly friendly relations since 1967 has also revived sympathy for Israel and reinstated the consensual recognition of Zionism as a basic ingredient of Jewish identity.

### *The Political Dimension of Zionism*

Being a small community, remote from the main arenas of Jewish life, it was through Zionism that South African Jewry was able to remain in touch with developments in world Jewry. Zionism served as the major link with the great leaders of the Jewish people and with the political and cultural issues of Jewish life. Especially significant in this respect were the periodic visits of emissaries such as David Wolffsohn, Chaim Weizmann, Nahum Sokolow, and Vladimir Jabotinsky. Moreover, the internalization of issues affecting world Zionism provided the South African community with a dimension of active political life.

To be sure, for a long time the Zionist

Federation's Executive, watchful over disciplined Zionist unity under its own aegis, gave no encouragement to the nurturing of party groups. Hence the first attempt to create a political group — the Mizrachi — proved abortive.<sup>37</sup> Somewhat more successful was the formation of a *Poalei Zion* group at the end of 1918. Founded on the local initiative of some Yiddish-speaking immigrants to South Africa, it attempted to create a synthesis between Jewish nationalism and socialist universalism. It was thus only with reservations that it cooperated with the Zionist Federation.<sup>38</sup> On the other hand, its offers to cooperate with the local International Socialist League (forerunner of the Communist Party) were rejected on the grounds of *Poalei Zion's* positive approach to nationalism. Thus, in the final analysis, *Poalei Zion* failed to achieve the synthesis it sought between Zionism and universalistic socialism, and by the end of 1921 it had disintegrated.

It was only out of the wave of the post-World War I immigrants that a more permanent political consciousness began to emerge in South African Zionism. Among this wave there were some from Palestine, although of *Litvak* origin, who acted as agents for the establishment of a branch of labor Zionism in South Africa. In this way a group of *Zeirei Zion* emerged. But *Zeirei Zion*, too, was unable to become a major force owing to the inapplicability of its labor ideology to the circumstances of the immigrant generation in South African Jewry. Upward economic mobility into middle class employer status in a society based on the labor of a grossly underprivileged Black working class was hardly con-

ducive to the *Zeirei Zion* ideology of "self-labor." Nonetheless, in contrast to *Poalei Zion*, *Zeirei Zion* was able to somehow survive in the South African environment, precisely because it had no affinity for international socialism and fully accepted the discipline of the Zionist Federation.<sup>39</sup> With the emergence in 1929 of the Revisionist Zionists, the traditionally nonpartisan Zionist Federation at last began to be politicized. At the combined insistence of the Revisionists and *Zeirei Zion* the former individual, 'best-man' system of election to World Zionist congresses was replaced with one based on party lists.<sup>40</sup>

The ideas of Jabotinsky were brought to South Africa by the same 1920s wave of *Litvak* Jewish immigrants, partly via Palestine, which brought the ideas of the *Zeirei Zion*.<sup>41</sup> Yet, from the beginning, South African Jews evinced a special receptivity to the militancy of Jabotinsky's views. It may be suggested that one factor which contributed to this was the deeply ingrained tradition of political Zionism for which Samuel Goldreich had been largely responsible; Revisionism projected itself as the true heir of political Zionism. Another factor was the operation of an inverse relationship between the poor climate for labor Zionism in South Africa and the good climate for Revisionism. Socialist Zionism was the natural counterpoise to the ideology of Jabotinsky. Its ideological weakness in South Africa was to the advantage of Revisionism. But the most important factor of all, would appear to be the purely personal impact of Jabotinsky himself when he visited the country in 1931, 1937, and 1938. The Revisionist, New Zionist

Organization of South Africa was the only political group to have its world leader serve as a local leader while he was in the country. By virtue of his stature and political experience Jabotinsky dominated the scene. He also founded and initially edited a weekly newspaper. Originally called *The Eleventh Hour* and later *The Jewish Herald*, it remains the major English-language organ of Revisionist Zionism to this day. Moreover, by declaring that he earnestly desired reunification of Zionism and that he aimed at making South African Jewry "the sounding board" for this, Jabotinsky cleverly forced the Zionist Federation into an apologetic posture. In the public's eye it seemed that the onus was on the Federation to demonstrate its desire for peace and unity. The Federation's Chairman, Nicolai Kirschner, admitted confidentially to the World Zionist Organization's office:

We have experienced a good deal of difficulty in satisfying even sincere supporters, who have been impressed by the offer of Mr. Jabotinsky to take part without conditions, in a round table peace conference... and we are frankly placed in a position of some embarrassment.<sup>42</sup>

Nevertheless, reinforced with appropriate explanations from London, the Zionist Federation was able to retain the allegiance of the great majority of South African Zionists. Despite the extraordinarily rapid burgeoning of a Revisionist following, Jabotinsky was somewhat over-optimistic after his third visit in March 1938, when he commented: "I believe that in a year's time all controlling positions in this country will be ours....South Africa is our main

field."<sup>43</sup> Revisionist Zionism did become a major force in South Africa, but not the dominant force. In the 1946 Zionist Congress elections the Revisionists gained 32% of the vote, making them the second largest party in the Federation when they returned to it not long thereafter.<sup>44</sup> Within the Federation they continued to be a highly contentious opposition group. They clashed with the majority over their support for the *Irgun Zvai Leumi*, their condemnation of the partition proposals, and their unwillingness to accept the Federation's discipline in fundraising. Since they were, in fact, a major source of funds for the *Irgun*, and later, for Menachem Begin's Herut party, they were conscious of carrying a great burden of responsibility and refused to allow the Federation "to starve the *Irgun* into submission."<sup>45</sup>

The majority of the Zionist Federation was firmly opposed to the conduct of partisan fundraising campaigns and a clause to that effect was incorporated into the Federation's constitution.<sup>46</sup> But the Revisionists were determined to raise partisan funds. They argued that the allocations made to the Revisionist movement by special agreements with the World Zionist Organization were inadequate and unfair. In 1957 they went ahead with an extensive campaign for funds headed by Menachem Begin himself. The Federation declared this a fundamental breach of discipline and expelled the Revisionists.<sup>47</sup> It was not until 1961 that the conflict over partisan fundraising was resolved and the Revisionists were re-accepted into the Federation.

During the 1940s the Zionist Socialist Party, which had succeeded

Zeirei Zion, underwent a transformation. The rise of Nazi-type Greyshirt organizations and the resultant confrontation between the two poles of Socialism and Fascism in South Africa had stimulated a leftist inclination among a number of South African born Jewish students and professionals, and some of them were attracted to the ideas of socialist Zionism. These new elements, headed by Louis Pincus, who was later to become Chairman of the World Zionist Organization, took over the reins of leadership in the Zionist Socialist Party and revitalized it ideologically and organizationally. Together with Mizrahi and the Jewish State Party,<sup>48</sup> the Zionist Socialists completed the politicization of the Federation's constitution. They demanded that its Executive be elected on the basis of party lists, as were delegates to World Zionist congresses, rather than on an individual "best-man" basis, as had been the practice in the past. To counter this the non-politically-aligned members of the Federation, who included prominent leaders, notably Nicolai Kirschner and Bernard Gering, decided to form an "Association of Nonparty Zionists," which would see to the preservation of the "best-man" election system. An intense controversy ensued, reaching a crescendo at the Nineteenth South African Zionist Conference in July 1943.<sup>49</sup> By a narrow margin the parties won the vote and the Executive has been elected on a party basis from that time onward.

But the party system remained a bone of contention in South African Zionism. After the creation of the State of Israel the opposition to the party

system grew even stronger. Bernard Gering led an "Antiparty League," which contended that it was ridiculous to debate the internal political issues of Israel from public platforms in South Africa and that party differences were irrelevant in the Diaspora.<sup>50</sup> However, the opponents of the party system faced a grave dilemma. On the one hand, they opposed the holding of party elections to Zionist conferences, considering them both wasteful and wrong in principle. On the other hand, how could the constitution be restored to its former nonparty basis without holding elections to secure the necessary two-thirds majority for the nonparty view? In the end they had no choice but to contest the elections as an "Association of South African Zionists." Of the 29,008 shekel-holders who went to the polls in the 1952 election, 5,190 voted for the Association. The largest vote was gained by the United General Zionist Party (8,218); the Zionist Socialist Party followed (6,486), and the United Zionist Revisionist Party was a close third (6,023).<sup>51</sup>

It was not until 1971 that elections were held again. In the interim the Executive was repeatedly reconstituted on the basis of mutual agreement between the parties. In practice, however, the nonparty view became increasingly prevalent, and the membership and activities of the parties underwent a steady decline. In 1958 the General Zionists abandoned their party alignment and combined with the Association of Zionists to form the United Zionist Association. The proponents of a nonparty approach thus became the largest single group in the Executive. The elections held in 1971, in compliance with the

World Zionist Organization's directives, were but a faint echo of former partisan enthusiasm. Only 16,763 shekel-holders went to the polls. The Zionist Revisionist Organization, which had retained somewhat greater cohesiveness than any other party, gained 35.99% of the vote, at last becoming the largest party on the Executive. Almost as if in anticipation of the political upheaval which was to bring the world leader of Revisionism, Menachem Begin, to power in Israel within a few years, a Revisionist, Julius Weinstein, became Chairman of the South African Zionist Federation.

*Contribution to the Emergence of Israel*

The extraordinary strength of Zionism in South Africa is reflected in the distinctive contribution that South African Jews have made to the emergence of Israel. Thus the record of South African Jewry in Zionist fundraising is unequalled in the world. General Smuts was right when he proudly told American Zionists of that record. Something of the scale of fundraising in South Africa and of its significance for the World Zionist Organization can be gained from the comparative figures of Keren Hayesod income from the major centers of Jewish population. Between 1922 and 1949, the contribution of the tiny South African Jewish community, *in absolute figures*, was second only to that of the gigantic community in the United States. The U.S. total was \$10,309,640; South Africa's, \$1,404,430. Countries with far larger Jewish communities raised much less.

England and Canada, for example, raised \$828,220 and \$687,814, respectively.<sup>52</sup> In the second decade of the Keren Hayesod's existence from 1929 to 1939, South African Zionism's record became even more disproportionately large; the United States contributed only \$5,804,212 whereas South Africa reached \$2,495,555. Even in the Second World War period from 1939 to 1945, South Africa remained second to the United States. It was only after 1945 that the United States' contribution rose dramatically to proportions more commensurate with its size and, simultaneously, England, Canada, and Latin America began to equal, or in some years, exceed, South Africa's contribution in absolute figures. However, the disparity in relative terms remains until this very day.

Perhaps the most extraordinary contribution made by South African Zionism to the emergence of Israel was its role in *Mahal* (Army Volunteers from the Diaspora) during the War of Independence. Owing to popular overestimations of the number of American Jews in *Mahal*, the disproportionate dimensions of South African participation have often been overlooked.<sup>53</sup> Although it is impossible to accurately determine the number of volunteers, owing to the confusion which prevailed in their classification and registration during the first few months of the war, my investigation into documents in the Israel Defence Force Archives have rendered the following figures as the most authoritative on record:

U.S.A. . . . . .	800
Britain . . . . .	800

South Africa . . . . .	600
Canada . . . . .	300
Scandinavia . . . . .	250
Holland & Belgium . . . . .	200
France . . . . .	1,000
Latin America . . . . .	300
Miscellaneous . . . . .	250
Total . . . . .	4,500

These figures related to volunteers actually registered in the various branches of the Israel Defence Forces. A recent study on American volunteers in Israel's War of Independence arrives at somewhat larger estimates by including other categories of volunteers such as Aliyah Bet crews and aircraft mechanics who remained in Europe<sup>54</sup>; between 1200 and 1400 Americans (including Canadians), between 1200 and 1500 British, and between 800 and 1,000 South Africans. The estimate for South Africa is certainly exaggerated. At most it was 700.<sup>55</sup> Yet even if the other estimates are valid there can be no doubt of the disproportionately large scale of South African participation.

South African Jewry has also made some distinctive contributions in the form of special projects established in Israel. The first of these was the Children's Village, *Kfar Yeladim*, which emerged out of the community-wide War Victims' Fund which was established in South Africa after World War I, one of whose aims was to bring Jewish orphans and destitute children from war-ravaged Eastern Europe. In a characteristic expression of Zionist hegemony in South Africa, the Zionists succeeded, despite opposition from non-Zionist elements, in passing a resolution that the Fund be used for establishing a youth village in

Palestine. The project was established in 1924, and it existed under South African control until it was finally taken over by the Keren Hayesod in 1931.<sup>56</sup>

Another of South African Jewry's projects was the building of one of the first modern planned townships in Israel — Afridar in Ashkelon. This project, like Kfar Yeladim, was also expressive of the Zionist orientation of South African Jewry. For it was sponsored, not by the Zionist Federation, but by the community-wide South African Jewish War Appeal. The major aim of this fund was relief for the survivors of the Holocaust, but, consonant with the Zionist outlook, it was directed toward constructive settlement in Israel. South African *olim* also made distinctive contributions to the economic development of the *yishuv*. In 1922, two former chairmen of the Zionist Federation, Lazar Braudo and Joseph Janower formed the South African Palestine Enterprise (*Binyan*) Corporation. The Palestine Cold Storage Company was established in 1929 by another Zionist who settled in the *yishuv*, Chaim Joffe of Cape Town. The Africa-Palestine Investment Company followed in 1934, and Palestine African Shippers, which acquired Peltours, was formed in 1944.

However, the pre-1948 record of aliyah from South Africa cannot be said to have been commensurate with the strength of the Zionist movement in that country. Indeed, although South African Zionism may be contrasted with American Zionism both in regard to its hegemony over communal life and in regard to its avowedly national content, it did not differ substantially from American Zionism in its attitude to



aliyah. As a "new-world" land of immigration and of beckoning individual freedom and economic opportunities — provided one had the good fortune to be white — there was little urge toward re-emigration from South Africa to Palestine. For Jews in South Africa, no less than in America, confidence in the continued viability of Jewish life in their new-world homes imparted a vicarious quality which enabled them to identify with the idea of a return to Zion without regarding it as directly applicable to themselves. However, the Zion which they vicariously sensed was absolutely vital as a haven for distressed European Jewry, was, they also sensed, a vital complement for their own Jewish future in the Diaspora. Zion was thus a complement rather than a substitute for their Diaspora, and the idea of aliyah as a personal obligation was scarcely incorporated within their universe of discourse. At best, aliyah was perceived as an act of altruistic service to the cause, or as an idiosyncratic act of personal fulfillment. In this spirit, a number of leaders of South African Zionism set a personal example by settling in Israel, notably Lazar Braudo and Joseph Janower, and by 1939 a few hundred South African Zionists had joined the *yishuv*.

Yet neither the expanding network of Young Israel societies nor even the Zionist Youth Council, formed in 1932, incorporated aliyah into their official aims. Even Habonim, in its original statement of aim, spoke only vaguely of stimulating Jewish boys and girls "to a realization of their heritage as Jews and their responsibilities, in particular those relating to the upbuilding of Eretz

Israel, which that heritage involves."<sup>57</sup> Under these circumstances, the first attempt to establish a *hachshara* (training) farm on the part of a few who did regard aliyah as a personal aim, was unable to fire the imagination of the youth. In 1933, a farm was placed at the disposal of the Zionist Youth Council by a prominent Zionist, Wolf Senior, and a two-year course of training in agriculture, Hebrew, and communal living was instituted under an instructor from Palestine. Twelve *chalutzim* (pioneers) left for Israel from this farm. But after two years it had to be closed for lack of manpower.

It was not until 1936 that the first youth movement ideologically committed to *chalutzit* (pioneering) was formed — Hashomer Hatzair. Its founders were a group of young Lithuanian-born immigrants to South Africa, who were joined in 1938 by some of the leaders of Habonim in search of a framework committed to the principle of "self-realization" through aliyah and kibbutz life. Hashomer Hatzair provided the basis for the re-establishment of a *hachshara* in June 1943, Kfar Balfouria near Johannesburg. Influenced by this example, *chalutz* groups began to emerge within Habonim, and in 1944 nine of its members joined the *hachshara* farm at Kfar Balfouria. The concepts of aliyah and *chalutzit* had at last begun to make inroads into the whole spectrum of Zionist youth. By the end of 1947, candidates for aliyah were running into the hundreds and the lack of certificates of immigration to Palestine began to be a problem. Thereafter, *hachshara* training, although always on a very modest scale,

became an accepted project of the South African Zionist Youth Council. With the declaration of the State of Israel in May 1948, *Mahal* absorbed, among its approximately 700 volunteers, a large part of the senior youth who were intending to settle in Israel, and at the beginning of 1949, forty-two chalutzim followed. Participation in *hachshara* reached its peak immediately before and after the creation of the State of Israel when Hashomer Hatzair, Habonim and the United Zionist Party youth maintained separate farms. Thereafter they began to lose their viability, united out of weakness, and finally the last farm was closed in 1963. However, graduates of the youth movements continued to join settlements on the land. By 1977 about a thousand were estimated to be living in kibbutzim and moshavim, the two largest concentrations being in Kibbutz Tzora and Kibbutz Yizreel.

Most *olim* from South Africa settled in the towns where they engaged in professional and business occupations. It has been reliably estimated that the overall size of the community of South African origin in Israel was about 7,500 persons at the end of 1976.<sup>59</sup> During 1977 there was a marked increase indicating the possibility of a rising wave of aliyah: the yearly number multiplied threefold from an average of 500 for the period 1971 to 1976, to 1,500 in 1977. Hence, by 1978 there were some 9,000 former South Africans living in Israel, representing a daughter community about 7% the size of its mother community of 120,000 in South Africa. According to Israel immigration statistics for the period 1969 to 1975, for every one thousand Jews in South Africa a

yearly average of 4.9 settled in Israel compared with 0.9 from the United States, 1.7 from Canada and 2.8 from the United Kingdom.

Hence the aliyah record of South African Jewry certainly excels that of other English-speaking communities. Indeed, were United States Jewry to have the same record it would mean a daughter community of nearly half a million former Americans in Israel. Yet it is difficult to arrive at unequivocal conclusions on the role of Zionism in motivating this aliyah. On the one hand, the influence of uncertainty about the socio-economic future of South Africa cannot be discounted as a determinant of aliyah. There is some correlation between aliyah increases and unsettled conditions in South Africa in the early 1960s and after 1976. Moreover, although Israel may be the single most important recipient of Jewish emigration from South Africa, there are indications that aliyah accounts for only about one-third of recent total Jewish emigration.<sup>59</sup> The other two-thirds emigrated mainly to the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, and Australia. This may well signify the limitations of Zionism in determining the emigration pattern of Jews in the western world. It is obvious that prosaic considerations of language, professional opportunity, and material prospects remain predominant. On the other hand, the very fact that a third chose Israel despite the possibility of other, materially more favorable options is not without significance. Moreover, there is some evidence that among South African Jews currently considering the eventuality of emigration, Israel is a high priority.<sup>60</sup> The by-now far-

reaching network of family and personal relations with those already settled in Israel may well have become a major consideration. It may therefore reasonably be inferred that the pre-

eminent role of Zionism in the communal life and identity modes of South African Jews remains an important determinant of its future.

### NOTES

Abbreviations: Z.F.A. — South African Zionist Federation Archives, Johannesburg; B.D.A. — South African Jewish Board of Deputies Archives, Johannesburg; C.Z.A. — Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem.

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. S. Halperin, *The Political World of American Zionism* (Detroit, 1961).

<sup>2</sup> See M. Gitlin, *The Vision Amazing: The Story of South African Zionism* (Johannesburg, 1950) pp.30ff.

<sup>3</sup> Z.F.A. *Report of Exec. to First Conference* (1905). The quotations are from Goldreich's presidential speech.

<sup>4</sup> In the archival records of the early years there is much evidence of this wide range of activities, e.g., *Minute Book of Dorshei Zion* (Cape Town, 4.11.1900), which discusses the Zionist Federation's concern for "the improvement of the moral position of our people and about prostitution which has increased greatly amongst our people."

<sup>5</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, (London), 8.5.1903.

<sup>6</sup> Z.F.A. *loc cit*.

<sup>7</sup> Z.F.A. *Report of Exec. to Fourth Conference* (1911).

<sup>8</sup> Z.F.A. *Reports & Accounts of Exec. to Twenty-First Conference* (November 1945—April 1947), p.17; *Report to the Twenty-Third Conference* (July 1952), p.16.

<sup>9</sup> Z.F.A. *The S.A. Zionist Federation Appeal to the Congress Tribunal of the World Zionist Organization* (May 1977), p.5.

<sup>10</sup> B.D.A. *Report of Exec.* (April 1914—March 1919), p.9; *Report of Exec.* (August 1923-

June 1925), p.2; see also *The South African Jewish Board of Deputies -- The Story of Fifty Years 1903-1953* (Reprinted from *Jewish Affairs*, June 1953), pp.28ff.

<sup>11</sup> Z.F.A. Marcia Gitlin; transcript of interview with Jack Alexander (1942).

<sup>12</sup> Z.F.A. *Memorandum of Conference between Representatives of the S.A. Jewish Board of Deputies and the South African Zionist Federation* (1.3.1942); B.D.A. *Minutes of Special Board of Deputies Conference* (Johannesburg, 15.3.1942).

<sup>13</sup> *Zionist Record*, 20.3.1942.

<sup>14</sup> Z.F.A. *Zionist Newsletter* (S.A. Zionist Fed. Information & Organisation Department, 27.5.1942).

<sup>15</sup> S.A. *Board of Jewish Education Constitution as Amended after the Seventh Conference* (March 1945), clause 2(a).

<sup>16</sup> Z.F.A. *Report of Hebrew Education Commission; Chairman, the Hon. Mr. Justice S.M. Kuper*, (1961); *Commission on Jewish Education, Report: Chairman, the Hon. Mr. Justice J. Herbstein* (May 29, 1961).

<sup>17</sup> For recent sociological confirmation of these observations, see Allie A. Dubb, *Jewish South Africans: A Sociological View of the Johannesburg Community*, (Rhodes Univ., 1977), esp. pp.114ff. Dubb states that

- "Zionism has been and is one of the most important and durable expressions of identity for South African Jews."
- <sup>18</sup> See S. Goldman, (ed.), *Brandeis on Zionism* (Washington, 1942).
- <sup>19</sup> These events are recorded in detail in the S.A. Jewish Board of Deputies' weekly, *Press Digest* for the period 1961-1966.
- <sup>20</sup> The quotations are from a typical statement by S.A. Zionist Federation leader Joseph Daleski (30.9.1963).
- <sup>21</sup> L. Pinshaw, "The South African Young Israel Federation," M. de Saxe (ed.), *The South African Jewish Year Book* (Johannesburg, 1929), pp.257-262.
- <sup>22</sup> I am indebted to Dr. Sergio Della Pergola of the Hebrew University's Institute of Contemporary Jewry for his assistance in making these estimates. They are derived from a comparison of periodic censuses of youth movement membership with estimated Jewish population figures for the relevant age-groups.
- <sup>23</sup> The evidence for the "Litvak" (Lithuanian Jewish) preponderance in South African Jewry includes: B.D.A. H. Sonnabend, *Statistical Survey of Johannesburg Jewish Population* (ms., 1935) and a "Register of Jewish Residents Seeking Naturalisation in the Cape Colony 1904-1906," to be found in the *Alexander Papers, University of Cape Town*.
- <sup>24</sup> The Quota Act of 1930 severely restricted immigration from countries outside the British Empire, the United States and Western and Northern Europe. Its main, but unstated, purpose was to restrict Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe.
- <sup>25</sup> See L.M. Thompson, *Politics in the Republic of South Africa* (Boston, 1966).
- <sup>26</sup> See W.K. Hancock, *Are There South Africans?* (The A. & W. Hoernlé Memorial Lecture; Johannesburg, 1966).
- <sup>27</sup> See L. Feldman, *Yidden in Dorem Afrika* (Vilna, 1937).
- <sup>28</sup> See G. Saron & L. Hotz (eds.), *The Jews in South Africa: A History* (Cape Town, 1955), p.89; these estimates are largely based upon figures given by a contemporary — Rabbi J.H. Hertz, in *Jewish Chronicle* (London) 20.4.1900.
- <sup>29</sup> *South African Jewish Chronicle*, 5.3.1920.
- <sup>30</sup> See e.g. Eric Louw, *Die Jodevraagstuk in Suid Afrika* (The Jewish Question in South Africa) (Cape Town, 1939); also Dr. Hendrik Verwoerd's article, "The Jewish Problem Regarded from the Nationalist Point of View," in *Die Transvaler*, 1.10.1937.
- <sup>31</sup> D. Dunsky, *Anti-Semitism in South Africa, What Shall We Do?* (Johannesburg, n.d.).
- <sup>32</sup> *Zionist Record*, 21.1.1937.
- <sup>33</sup> *The Balfour Declaration: Tenth Anniversary* (Johannesburg, 1927), p.22.
- <sup>34</sup> J.C. Smuts, *A Great Historic Vow: Address on British and Jewish Responsibilities in Palestine* (London, 1930).
- <sup>35</sup> This development is evident in sections of the Afrikaans press during 1947 and 1948. E.g., a series of articles in *Die Transvaler*, 2,4, & 9 September 1948, and *Horison*, May 1947.
- <sup>36</sup> On this point see G. Shimoni, "Afrikaner and Jewish Nationalism: Are They Comparable?" *Jewish Affairs* (August 1971), pp.8-23.
- <sup>37</sup> This took place in 1905. It was not until 1919 that Mizrachi was established. *Zionist Record*, 19.9.1919; also see *S.A. Jewish Observer, 60th Anniversary Issue* (December 1962).
- <sup>38</sup> The development of the Poalei Zion group is reflected in its journal *Unser Weg* (May 1919-November 1921).
- <sup>39</sup> See *S.A. Jewish Frontier* (December 1962).
- <sup>40</sup> *Zionist Record*, 21.1.1929. In 1929 South African shekel-holders were presented, for the first time, with separate party lists for election to the World Zionist Congress. However, elections to the local Zionist Federation's Executive remained on a "best-man" basis.
- <sup>41</sup> Foremost among the founders of Revisionist Zionism in South Africa was Jedidya Blumenthal, who came to South Africa in 1924. He was born in Lithuania but spent some time in Palestine before coming to South Africa. In a series of articles which he wrote for the *S.A. Jewish Chronicle* (May, June, July 1929), he was the first to propagate Jabotinsky's views.
- <sup>42</sup> C.Z.A. S 52310, "Nicolai Kirschner to Sec. Zionist Org. London," 22.4.1937.
- <sup>43</sup> Cited in J.B. Schechtman, *The Jabotinsky Story: Vol. II, Fighter and Prophet* (New York, 1961), p. 320.
- <sup>44</sup> *Z.F.A. Reports & Accounts of Exec. to*

- Twenty-First Conference* (November 1945-April 1947), p.17. These were elections to the World Zionist Congress, conducted before the New Zionist Organization had formally disbanded in South Africa. However, after it disbanded and its former members were re-accepted into the S.A. Zionist Federation they took up their representation on the basis of the percentage polled in these elections.
- <sup>45</sup> Interviews with Harry Hurwitz, May 1971; Raphael Kottlowitz, May 1968. Cf. E.I. Tavin, *Ha-Hazit Ha-Sh'niyah: Ha-Irgun Ha-Z'vai Ha-Le'umi B'arot Europa, 1946-1948* (Tel Aviv, 1973), p.145. According to Tavin the funds received from South Africa in the period from January 1946 to July 1948 totalled 110,000 pounds sterling.
- <sup>46</sup> Z.F.A. *Constitution of the S.A. Zionist Federation as Amended at the Twenty-Fifth S.A. Zionist Conference*, Article IV (i).
- <sup>47</sup> Z.F.A. *Report to Twenty-Sixth S.A. Zionist Conference*, (1959), pp.20ff.
- <sup>48</sup> The Jewish State Party consisted of those Revisionists who had refused to follow Jabotinsky's exit from the World Zionist Organization. Its leading figure was Joseph Daleski.
- <sup>49</sup> The debate is reported in detail in *Zionist Record*, 6.8.1943. However, the new election system only became operational after the revised constitution had been formally accepted at the next Conference in November 1945.
- <sup>50</sup> Z.F.A. *Report to the Twenty-Third Conference* (July 1952), p.26. The Mizrahi Federation gained 2,902 votes and the Independent Zionist Revisionists 192 votes.
- <sup>51</sup> Z.F.A. *S.A. Zionist Federation, Thirty-Second Conference* (August 31-4 September 1972), p.2. An extraordinary facet of these elections was the entry of the *Habonim* youth movement which gained 15.68% of the votes.
- <sup>52</sup> *Office of Keren Hayesod, Keren Hayesod Income from Donations -- April 1921 to September 1948 by Countries* (compiled 5.11.1970).
- <sup>53</sup> *Israel Defence Force Archives, 1308/50, file 435*. Report to Chief of Staff by Akiva Skidell. Cf. overestimations of the American *Mahal* participation in P.E. Lapide, *A Century of U.S. Aliyah* (Jerusalem, 1961), p.90.
- <sup>54</sup> A.J. Heckelman, *American Volunteers and Israel's War of Independence*, (New York, 1974), pp.238,242. Heckelman's conclusions approximate those of the present writer. He speaks of the "shocking" fact that participation from the United States was, in proportionate terms, only "one-fiftieth that of South Africa."
- <sup>55</sup> Z.F.A. *Confidential Report on the Manpower Department of the S.A. Zionist Federation* (August 1949). This report provides an accurate check from the South African end on the Israel Defence Force document cited above. It gives the figure of 646 volunteers sent directly from South Africa. A few tens of volunteers who were already in Israel at the time war broke out may be added to these figures, making an estimated total of about 700.
- <sup>56</sup> Z.F.A. *South African Committee for Kfar Hayeladim, Minute Books* (1927-1931).
- <sup>57</sup> Z.F.A. *Habonim Files* (1935).
- <sup>58</sup> *South African Jewish Population Study* (S.A. Jewish Board of Deputies & Institute of Contemporary Jewry, Hebrew University, 1977), S. Della Pergola, *Advance Report No. 2: Emigration*, p.2.
- <sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p.9. This rough estimate is based on a survey question on "Place of residence of children of heads of Jewish households living outside parental house" (1974).
- <sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, "Israel was largely preferred as a possible country for emigration, being mentioned by some 80% of households considering such an eventuality and specifying a country to settle."

