South African text; Zionist palimpsest: Israeli critics read Alan Paton's *Cry, the Beloved Country**

Nitzan Tal

Louise Bethlehem

The contemporary mobilization of the apartheid-Israel analogy on the part of activists and academics alike obscures the fact that it has a long history of use on the part of Hebrew-speaking writers and intellectuals. Some of the earliest comparative references to apartheid arose from the Hebrew translation and stage adaptation of Alan Paton's celebrated 1948 novel *Cry, the Beloved Country*. Departing from the performative focus of Eitan Bar-Yosef who uses blackface in the stage adaptation to reflect on Jewish whiteness in the nascent state of Israel, we analyse critical intellectual responses to the prose translation on the part of figures who were very differently positioned in relation to the hegemonic Zionist ideology of the period. Analysis of the commentary by the socialist Rivka Gurfein, the liberal Ezriel Carlebach, and the revisionist Yohannan Pogrebinsky, allows us to position apartheid as a heuristic device (Bethlehem, "Apartheid—The Global Itinerary") through which to chart debates *internal* to Israeli politics in the early years of the Zionist state. These help to expose the constitutive ambivalence of Israel as a "colonial post-colony" in Joseph Massad's reckoning, thus touching on the very self-definition of the Jewish state.

Keywords: Apartheid, colonialism, Zionism, Israel, Palestine, Holocaust memory, Alan Paton, *Cry, the Beloved Countr*y.

Nitzan Tal is a PhD candidate in the Department of Comparative Literature at Cornell University. She was part of the European Research Council (ERC) Consolidators Grant for the project "Apartheid—The Global Itinerary: South African Cultural Formations in Transnational Circulation, 1948-1990" in the years 2014-2016. She is currently working on a project interrogating contemporary Hebrew and South-African novels for their treatment of culpability and complicity. Department of Comparative Literature, Cornell University, Ithaca, USA;

European Research Council Project APARTHEID-STOPS, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel.

Email: nt354@cornell.edu.

ORCID identifier: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3589-8036

Louise Bethlehem is Associate Professor in the Department of English and in the Program in Cultural Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. In December 2013, she was awarded a European Research Council (ERC) Consolidators Grant for the project "Apartheid—The Global Itinerary: South African Cultural Formations in Transnational Circulation, 1948-1990." https://scholars.huji.ac.il/ercapartheid/home. She has published extensively on South African literary and cultural history, including a monograph entitled Skin Tight: Apartheid Literary Culture and its Aftermath (2006, Hebrew translation 2011). Louise Bethlehem has co-edited eight volumes on African and South African history and literary history, cultural studies, and apartheid-era expressive culture. The latest of these comprise two interlinked special issues, "Cultural Solidarities: apartheid and the anticolonial commons of world literature," co-edited with Stefan Helgesson and Gül Bilge Han, Safundi 19 no. 3 (2018); and "Cultural Solidarities: itineraries of anti-apartheid expressive culture" co-edited with Lindelwa Dalamba and Uhuru Phalafala. Safundi 20 no. 2 (2019). https://www.louisebethlehem.com.

ORCID identifier: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2567-0134

Principal Investigator, European Research Council Project APARTHEID-STOPS, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel; English and Cultural Studies, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel.

Email: louise.bethlehem@mail.huji.ac.il

***Funding**

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Program (FP/2007-2013); ERC Grant Agreement (no. 615564).

South African text; Zionist palimpsest: Israeli critics read Alan Paton's *Cry, the Beloved Country**

Over the past 15 years, analogies between the state of Israel and apartheid South-Africa have been a central tool in the struggle for Palestinian liberation. Scholars and activists who evoke or contest the analogy have variably focused on the official and unofficial policies of the two regimes: their ideologies; segregated infrastructures and legal systems; stance with regard to international law and U.N declarations, and much more.[1] What the archives tell us is that Israelis across the political spectrum have been invoking and debating the South-African analogy since the early 1950s, a fact easily overlooked in the present context. Analogy is, of course, a cognitive process as well as a rhetorical tool. We understand faraway contexts through our own experience and adapt the stories of others to enhance our understanding of our own immediate circumstances. In the early stages of the establishment of the state of Israel and of apartheid (both born officially in 1948), news of political events in South Africa was partly comprehended in relation to events unfolding in Israel/Palestine. Simultaneously, the meaning of South African cultural artefacts shifted as they traversed Middle-Eastern geographical and national borders.

As we will demonstrate, some of the earliest comparative references of this kind first arose in the context of the transnational cultural mediations of Alan Paton's celebrated 1948 novel *Cry, the Beloved Country*, whether with respect to its Hebrew translation or to the Israeli adaptation of Maxwell Anderson and Kurt Weill's 1949 Broadway musical, *Lost in the Stars*.[2] In a path-breaking article, the Israeli literary critic, Eitan Bar-Yosef has pointed to the conflicting interpretations evoked by the Israeli stage adaptation, *Za`aki erets ahuva,* staged at the Habima national theatre in

1953.[3] Where Bar-Yosef brilliantly uses the performance of blackface on the national stage to analyze the nature of Jewish whiteness in the nascent state of Israel, we have chosen to focus on the literary reception of the translated novel itself. In the discussion that follows, we map three responses to Paton's work on the part of figures emplaced within the fold of hegemonic Ashkenazi or white European Israeli society in the early 1950s: the socialist author Rivka Gurfein; the liberal writer and journalist Ezriel Carlebach, founder and editor of the important Zionist newspaper *Ma`ariv*; and the militant right-wing revisionist, Yohannan Pogrebinsky.

Through their responses, we seek better to understand how "apartheid"—somewhat anachronistically distilled as the central concern of Paton's work despite the fact that his novel was written on the cusp of the coming into being of the new regime—served as a conduit for debates *internal* to Israeli politics of the day that touched on the very self-definition of the Jewish state. To understand the way this South African novel animated the thought of Jewish-Israeli readers in the early 1950s is to probe at the process through which we understand distant events against the background of already-acquired schemas of ideology and collective memory. In this case, the process led to the collapse of that distance. The reviewers used apartheid to examine the memory of Jewish persecution and the Holocaust, to debate various inflections of Zionism with direct reference to their immediate surroundings, and to investigate the fraught relationship between these issues. In doing so, they expressed varying stances about the ability to sense and to respond to the pain of others and about the merits and limits of accountability, which play out—more or less consciously—with regard to the Palestinian others whom the authors project, as well as the imagined South African subjects of the original text. The resultant mapping, we contend, has consequences for Israeli cultural history of the period as well as for the so-called apartheid analogy as it is

used in current political debate concerning the occupation of Palestine and opposition to the actions of the Israeli state more generally.

Mobilizing Analogy

In a recent series of interventions, Louise Bethlehem has countered the self-declared isolationism of the apartheid regime, historically a pillar of South Africa's foreign policy, with the claim that apartheid in fact served as an apparatus of transnational cultural production.[4] This is firstly a matter of the circulation of the signifier itself. Jacques Derrida famously asserted that apartheid constitutes a "violent arrest of the mark," based on the untranslatability of the Afrikaans neologism which, he observed, was assimilated intact into other languages.[5] The coming to power of the National Party in South Africa in 1948 saw the term "apartheid" enter the international lexicon where it generated massive debate.[6] The seeming fixity of the word "apartheid" to which Derrida alluded (itself disputed in debate with Derrida by Anne McClintock and Rob Nixon) masks difference: once in motion, the original signifier was repeatedly mobilized in the context of political struggles beyond South Africa.[7] Like the signifier "apartheid," Louise Bethlehem argues, works of expressive culture (texts, songs, plays, photographs) generated in opposition to apartheid also travelled; and they too acquired new meanings in the process. Historically, the itineracy of these works of expressive culture has allowed groups and individuals embroiled in various contexts of violence and injustice to understand themselves anew in the process of deploying or resisting the analogy with South Africa.[8]

As researchers with affiliations to the Israeli academy in what might be termed "the time of an analogy," we understand ourselves to be "implicated subjects" in Michael Rothberg's phrase—that is to say, we do not stand outside the circuits within

which debates regarding the Israel-apartheid analogy are mobilized.[9] "To what extent can the histories of these two countries be juxtaposed?" ask John Soske and Sean Jacobs in the introduction to their 2015 edited volume titled *Apartheid Israel: The Politics of Analogy*. "Do South Africa's experiences of settler-colonialism and apartheid provide insights that can sharpen our understanding of Israeli politics and society?"[10] While Soske and Jacobs are careful to frame their argument in epistemological rather than identitarian terms, their dating of the analogy to the 1970s needs adjustment.[11] Alternative accounts, most influentially that of Keith P. Feldman, have unearthed an earlier trail of engagements between exiled Palestinians working at the Palestine Research Centre in Beirut, and radical African American activists and intellectuals that established the salience of the South African case for the United States and Palestine alike.[12]

Scholarship concerning the triangulation between South Africa, the United States and Israel/Palestine is both germane and increasingly common. Yet it is important not to overlook the fact that Israeli authors, journalists and intellectuals writing in Hebrew deployed apartheid as a signifier as far back as the early 1950s, a few short years after the 1948 Arab-Israeli war. Israel's admission to the United Nations in 1949 rapidly led to the need for Israeli diplomats to weigh up their positions on apartheid in the diplomatic sphere, as Rotem Giladi has shown.[13] Where broader debate in civil society is concerned, however, the question of what apartheid meant to Israeli Jews was massively influenced by the unprecedented transnational circulation of the work of Alan Paton, prison reformist, founder of the Liberal Party in South Africa, and author of the celebrated 1948 novel, *Cry, the Beloved Country*.

Paton in Hebrew: Parsing Israeli (Post-)Colonialism

Accounts of the itineracy of apartheid-era expressive culture might do well to begin with Paton's landmark work, as the scholarship of Andrew van der Vlies, Leslie Cowling and Rita Barnard richly attests.[14] Paton's novel "is perhaps the most spectacularly successful and internationally recognisable 'South African' novel," writes van der Vlies, one of the leading commentators on its international reception.[15] Although Paton's novel was first published in New York in February 1948 just prior to the National Party's election in May that year, it was read concurrently with the consolidation of apartheid and became emblematic, in the United States in particular, of a liberal ameliorative variant of opposition to the new regime that avoided the more strident category of protest literature, as van der Vlies points out.[16] What van der Vlies deems the "hypercanonical" status of this text, in a phrase he borrows from Jonathan Arac, must be supplemented with an account of the "hypertransmission" of *Cry, the Beloved Country*, a term Bethlehem proposes to foreground processes attendant on the transmediation and adaptation of the novel beyond the circuits of print culture.[17]

One tangent of this highly ramified apparatus of circulation manifests in the Hebrew-language translation of the novel, as well as in the translation and Hebrew-language staging of Maxwell Anderson and Kurt Weill's 1949 Broadway adaptation of Paton's novel, *Lost in the Stars*, a mere five years after the establishment of the State of Israel. This essay investigates the echoes of the literary translation; yet Bar-Yosef's pioneering work on the stage production which we have already noted makes a point that is worth reiterating:

> [W]hile most Israelis saw Habima's *Cry* as an emblem of Israel's struggle against colonial subjugation and racial prejudice, others employed the production in a critique of Zionism. In these oppositional readings, Israel was associated not with South Africa's black victims but rather with their white oppressors. Decades before

> the analogy between the policies of Israel and apartheid would become widespread, some Israelis engaged Paton's plot in order to expose racism at home.[18]

Bar-Yosef attributes the musical's capacity for what he terms "elusiveness" to a variety of factors including: Paton's reactionary Christian liberalism, the fusion of colonial, anticolonial and post-colonial elements in Israeli history and ideology and the "slippery nature of Jewish whiteness" in relation to racial divides.[19] It is surely a commentary on the multivalence of the Hebrew adaptation (Bar-Yosef's "elusiveness") and on the pragmatism of the Israeli political establishment alike, that the political elite saw no contradiction between hosting the founding political leader of the apartheid state, D. F. Malan, at a performance of the play during the latter's state visit to Israel in June 1953, but then, the following month, affording the same privilege to Malan's black opponents, Walter Sisulu and Duma Nokwe, who saw the play while *en route* to the Soviet bloc and China to negotiate the supply of arms to the liberation movement.[20] The actions of the Israeli political elite amply bear out Bar-Yosef's claims concerning "the tension between cultural fantasy and realpolitik" that attached to the play. This same tension extended between "Zionism's anticolonial desire and its colonial dimensions: the Hebrew production of *Cry the Beloved Country* [sic] was the reverse of Malan's visit but also its duplication."[21]

In the context of today's political sensibilities, the anticolonial imaginary associated with Zionism on the part of its Jewish adherents demands explication. Joseph Massad contends that while "colonial" and "post-colonial" are terms often used to designate a historical trajectory, settler-colonialism and other colonial conditions produce colonial and post-colonial experiences contemporaneously.[22] For Zionist Jews, the construction of a new hegemony engendered an especially complex relationship with colonialism, he argues. Early proponents of Zionism including Theodor Herzl, Leo

Pinsker, Moses Hess and others saw it as an explicitly colonial project that would serve to counteract European antisemitism, while some of these leaders including Herzl, actively sought imperial sponsorship in Italy, Germany, and England.[23] The colonial nature of the Zionists' venture "whitened" the Jews in Massad's reckoning: "European Jews and gentiles alike viewed European Jews as 'Europeans' only insofar as they were undertaking a colonial venture."[24] These attitudes were not static but responded to shifts within Europe and the global south. By the 1930s it was clear that the term "colonialism" could no longer be used to refer to Jewish agricultural settlement in Palestine.[25] While maintaining their European identity and thus their perceived readiness for statehood and their ability to "modernize" the "East," Zionists simultaneously identified themselves as descended from a Semitic people whose origins were in Palestine. As the expression of Zionist affinities with colonialism gave way to an anti-colonial rhetoric directed against the British as colonizers, so too did the Zionist movement lay claim to indigeneity, portraying the Palestinians as the colonizers of the land which the Zionists had repatriated.[26] "Consequently," Massad argues, following Edward Said among others, "it is pre-Israel Palestine that represents a colonial-era in Zionist discourse with Israel being its post-colonial successor."[27]

Each of the Hebrew-speaking critics of Paton's novel discussed below held a well-established public stance on Israel's complex (post)colonial condition. The contradictory ideological freight of Zionism in the early years of the independent Israeli state is evident in their responses to the print circulation of *Za`aki erets ahuva* in Hebrew. The critical commentary produced in response to Paton's novel provides an alternative avenue for assessing the dense interplay between whiteness and blackness, colonialism and anticolonialism, Zionism and apartheid, that Bar-Yosef routes through embodied performance in the stage adaptation whose cumulative cultural prominence

eventually overshadowed the translated text. [28] As they review or reference the novel, our three critics expose their own ideological predispositions, all the while pointing to contexts not fully addressed by Bar-Yosef that nevertheless loomed large in the Israeli encounter with Paton's text: the socialist political philosophy of the ruling party, the Palestinian *nakba* (literally, catastrophe), and the looming shadow of the Holocaust. Thus distant political strife – Paton's account of race relations in South Africa accessed through fiction – serves to put on display inconsistencies and fault-lines within Zionism during the early years of the State of Israel.

Before we expand on these dimensions of the reception of Paton's text, a few disclaimers are in order. The history of Israel's foreign policy with regards to South Africa has been researched elsewhere and is beyond the scope of this article.[29] We also cannot offer a comprehensive survey of the history of Israeli media reports on South Africa—reports whose significance for understanding of the history of the analogy from its Jewish-Israeli side should not be underestimated. However, it is worth noting that Hebrew newspapers in Palestine were reporting on the fraught race relations in South-Africa as early as 1947 (*Al Hamishmar*); that the term "apartheid" was used in Israel to name the National Party's policy starting in June of 1948 (*Palestine Post* 1948); and that the Israeli news-reader would have been familiar with key South-African political figures. The mediation of South African current events was always shot through with a complex identificatory stance. Thus, for example, a single news article might feature a journalist situating himself as European when referring to the British mandate as a misfortune shared by South Africa and Israel, while also advancing an analogy between Black South African miners and Jewish victims of the Holocaust (*Al Hamishmar* 1947). On top of this web of affinities, South African news was often reported with an anxious eye towards the fate of South African Jewry (e.g., *Hamashkif* 1948). This media

landscape frames Gurfein's, Carlebach's and Pogrebinsky's writings as they responded to Paton's novel.

Paton in the Service of the Socialist Israeli Jew: Rivka Gurfein

A precise publication date for the Hebrew version of Paton's novel is unavailable. However, we can establish that one of the era's leading newspapers received an early copy for review in January 25, 1951 (*Al Hamishmar*, January 25, 1952*).* The novel was translated by Aharon Amir, a leading poet and translator and member of the Canaanite cultural movement.[30] It was published by Am Oved, an influential publisher associated with Israel's Labour Federation or *Histadrut.*[31] The first review of *Za`aki erets ahuva*, by Rivka Gurfein, appeared in the same newspaper (*Al Hamishmar,* July 4, 1952). Gurfein (1908-1983) was a Galician-born member of *Hashomer hatsa`ir*, a Zionist-socialist political movement. A member of the socialist-leaning literary intelligentsia, she was a frequent reviewer for the paper. Gurfein's assessment of Paton's novel appears favourable—at least, initially so. She particularly commends his skill in depicting "people bearing simple human pain with dignity" and expresses approval for his capacity to bring "distant landscapes" to life in a manner reminiscent of his American reviewers who held the novel up as social documentation.[32]

Yet Gurfein quickly moves beyond the theme of "dignity in the face of suffering" that serves as a staple of (white) American responses to Paton's novel.[33] To the extent that the novel elicits forms of identification with both its white and its black characters in equal measure, she sees it as flawed. In her view, the readers of the novel are lulled by its "Christian sweetness" into acquiescing to a de-historicized version of the 1940s in South Africa: a historical vagueness which for the socialist Gurfein connotes a neglect of ethico-political obligations. Gurfein resorts to anaphora to convey something of her own experience as a reader:

> All of a sudden, suspicion arises: something is wrong here! This lamentation over the corrupting influences of the city [Johannesburg] which does not specify what goes on there and does not expose the people at fault – it is too vague. All of a sudden, something else is revealed to us: all the white people in the novel are noble, righteous people […]. Strange – for we know completely different things about the actions of South African whites, especially when we remember the date: nineteen forty-six!"[34]

Gurfein's historical allusion demonstrates how her socialist mind-set differentiates her evaluation of the novel from its reception in the United States. The proto-apartheid depicted in the novel is very much a worker's issue in Gurfein's estimation. She directs us emphatically to the massive action taken by 76,000 striking members of the African Mine Workers' Union (AMWU) in South Africa in August 1946, whose brutal repression on the part of Jan Smuts's government left over one thousand black miners injured and twelve dead at the hands of the police.[35] Fifty-two white, black and Indian South Africans stood trial for their role in the strike in what the communist activist, Rusty Bernstein, termed "the first mass political trial of the post-war" era in South Africa.[36] The strike was widely reported in the international press.[37] The socialist press in Israel also covered the strike, interpreting it as a workers' struggle with a racial dimension.[38] Gurfein's pointed allusion to this historical context enables her to rail against the "fog" of Paton's literary representations of South Africa.[39] Her evocation of the miners' strike politicizes her reading, affording her an opportunity to denounce what she presents as the novel's "double mission": its advocacy "for Christianity and for South-African whites" which "completely [blurs] all the problems that this subject-matter should have brought forth."[40] This historicization neatly punctures various "universalist" readings of the novel, even on the part of black readers. Contrast Gurfein's accusations that white characters – and whites in general – elude real criticism in the novel with the pronouncements of Alain Locke, a key figure in the Harlem

Renaissance, who was of the opinion that *Cry, the Beloved Country* offers "a portrayal unsurpassed for deep and uncondescending identification with the predicaments of the South African native".[41]

At the same time, it is important to observe how Gurfein's historicizing focus rooted in an analysis of political economy is relinquished where texts written by Zionist socialist authors are concerned, texts whose aesthetic lapses are tolerated provided the ideological message of their works is deemed sufficiently important. This exceptionalism is congruent with the Zionist socialist construction of its nationalist project as partaking in anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist efforts.[42] The socialist mindset of Gurfein and her peers made them especially beholden to a view of Israel as established against, rather than consolidated by means of, colonialism. A socialist version of the "civilizing mission" made the advantages of (socialist) Jewish settlement in mandatory Palestine and in the early Zionist state self-evident to the Jewish socialist intellectual elite of the times, largely recusing their theoreticians from dealing with relations between its settlers and the native Palestinian population, as Massad observes.[43] Gurfein displays a typical ideological blind spot when, for instance, she commends Israel Even-Nur's account of Zionist settlers living near the Dead Sea for portraying "the Jew's willingness to revive every corner […] of his ancient homeland" (*Al Hamishmar*, August 14, 1944), or when she commends Yonat and Alexander Sened's portrayal of a Zionist settlement in the Negev desert for its "pioneer" protagonists' assumption of "historical responsibility for the fate of the [Jewish] people" – a different historicity entirely than the economically driven socialist calculus which she applies to Paton's novel.[44] Patently colonial tropes surface in Gurfein's assessment of the vacant desert that the novel depicts. It lies "dying under the scalding sun […] beneath the apathy of generations," while simultaneously seething with what Gurfein construes as the

"Bedouin threat" [*sakanat habedouim*]."[45] The mythical biblical time invoked here on the part of the secular socialist critic has more than a passing affinity with the ahistoricism of Paton's own religious idiom. At no time does the socialist Gurfein bring the terms of an economic critique to bear on her status as a settler in the disputed land of Israel/Palestine, ignoring her own role as a beneficiary of the removal of Arab workers from their land during the 1948 Arab-Israeli War. [46] Reviewing Gurfein's reviews, it becomes apparent that she resolves the pervasive tension between socialism and nationalism characteristic of left-wing Zionism in the early years of the Israeli state in an inventive fashion: she is a socialist when she reviews foreign fiction, but a nationalist when she critiques works drawn from the milieu to which she belongs.

Not all Jewish Israelis identified with the socialist leanings of the majority government under the leadership of David Ben Gurion. Some, like the next writer we address, held political beliefs much closer to the liberalism that *Cry, the Beloved Country* espouses. By the time the liberal journalist and editor Ezriel Carlebach references the translated novel in his column in 1953, enough Hebrew-speaking Israelis had purchased Paton's translated book to make it a best-seller and to justify additional print runs, while the play bearing the same name continued to enjoy unprecedented success. [47] It is partly on this account that Carlebach can omit direct reference to *Za`aki erets ahuva* in his text, alluding to it instead so as to construct an analogy with contemporary injustices in the local political arena.

Paton in the Service of the Liberal Jew: Azriel Carlebach

Ezriel Carlebach, founder and editor of the liberal Zionist newspaper *Ma'ariv*, was a prolific author who penned a weekly column under a well-known pseudonym.[48] On a certain Friday in December 1953, that column was dedicated to a criticism of Israel's policy of land expropriation, carried out in the aftermath of the 1948 Arab-Israeli War.

Let there be no confusion: Carlebach welcomed Israel's victory in "the war of independence," and did not take issue with the legitimacy of the Israeli expropriation of land left behind by displaced Palestinians (Carlebach terms them "Arabs") who purportedly "fled before us one day."[49] It is not the *nakba* as such but rather the confiscation of the property of the newly-termed "Israeli Arabs" that Carlebach feels is a gross injustice. Marshalling the very public stage of his column, Carlebach criticizes the bureaucratic mechanism of expropriation as well as the direct beneficiaries of the expropriation policy – the kibbutz movement and other rural, socialist-oriented settlements whose politics were aligned with those of the government. The fact that this master of rhetoric chose the title "*Za`aki erets ahuva"* [literally, "cry the beloved country"] for his column underscores the cultural impact he believed the phrase to have achieved. Though he merges the novel and the more-popular play – going so far as referring to the text across both genres in the same sentence – Carlebach's column provides a particularly salient example of the reattribution of Paton's original novel and its context.

Carlebach formulates his critique of the policies of the Israeli government as an emotional plea to his young daughter, taking her and his readers on an imagined trip to the Galilee. What work does the Paton-inspired rhetoric perform for the seasoned Israeli publicist? Conjuring up an imagined scene of the public reading of one of Paton's novels in an unspecified *kibbutz* in the Galilee, Carlebach exhorts:

> Come, my daughter, to the farms on that plundered land… [In the *kibbutz*] they will speak loftily against racial supremacy, and against the plunderers of the natives' lands in faraway Africa. Then turn your ears away from the noble words, and turn it towards the earth of the beloved country on which these

> speeches are borne. Hearken – and you shall hear: this beloved land of ours also cries out.[50]

"That *plundered* land" is the land which the kibbutz now farms, and on which its members self-righteously condemn white South Africans for being "*plunderers* of the natives' land."[51] Carlebach draws a comparison between the fate of black South Africans and Palestinians resident in Israel, and in so doing, identifies the beneficiaries of each system and their culpability. Yet in the logic of imagined identification that Carlebach outlines, the plight of black South Africans as well as that of Palestinian residents of Israel under martial rule is secondary to the imminent danger that faces Jewish Israelis in his reckoning – the danger of becoming tyrants. The discourse of kinship summoned through the address to Carlebach's child clearly demarcates the implied audience of the text. The thematic tropes further indisputably mark its perspective as one that is internal to the Zionist polity. Black South Africans and Palestinians in Israel become, ironically, the historical Jew's mirror-image – thus rationalising the (in)justice they deserve.[52]

Although the comparison between South-African and Arab victimhood is central to the construction of Carlebach's argument, several other historical analogues figure prominently throughout the text. The centrality of the memory of Jewish suffering for the Zionist ethos becomes a theme which galvanizes Carlebach's opposition to the expropriation policies of a Zionist state governed by his political opponents. Paradoxically, it is Paton's dehistoricizing Christian rhetoric – which Gurfein deemed reactionary – that allows Carlebach to access Jewish cultural memories of suffering. Paton's rhetoric in the novel draws heavily on the Scriptures.[53] In Aharon Amir's Hebrew translation, the biblical undertones of the novel are further emphasized.[54] Carlebach utilizes this register to route his liberal perspective on land expropriation

through the metaphor of the eternal Jew. “I am a Jew”, he tells his daughter, a fact that conditions his imagined response to the expropriation officer of the Israeli socialist regime:

> I see a scribe of the Spanish Throne sitting and writing on parchment – ‘their property is hereby sequestered by the state’ – for my forefathers did not believe in the God of justice on Queen Isabella’s cross; I see a German clerk signing ‘All Jewish property is legally confiscated under the law of purchase from non-Aryans [. . .][55]

Carlebach knows that these historical parallels to the Spanish Inquisition and Nazi Germany will inevitably be seen as unjust by his readership. This turn in the text is profoundly conflictual. While Carlebach metes out harsh criticism to the Israeli regime, he employs its underlying rhetoric of justification as the descendant of oppressed and powerless Jewish communities: from biblical times, through the medieval expulsion of Spanish Jews and culminating with the recent Nazi genocide. Carlebach traces the replacement of one collective subject-position with another: the historically-oppressed Jews have now assumed the stance of the perpetrator. As the column progresses, he prays that the leaders responsible for the “plunder” of Arab lands will be forgiven “because they are very new to the wisdom of sovereignty.”[56] The phrase further underscores the mythic construction of modern political Zionism as a continuation of the ancient kingdom of Judea – it was after all in that mythic period of “sovereignty” that the laws prohibiting “the plunder of the poor man’s ewe” to which Carlebach alludes were first established.[57]

The narrator’s daughter, a figure who reappears frequently in the text, also plays a double role in its construction. Firstly, she allows Carlebach to duplicate Paton’s technique of apostrophe, particularly where the text relocates a political drama within the field of kinship relations. Where Paton’s narrator exhorts “Cry, the beloved country,

for the unborn child that is the inheritor of our fear", Carlebach substitutes: "I am very afraid for you, my daughter, for […] it is you who will pay for all this."[58] Carlebach's daughter serves as a metonymy for the new generation of Israelis born in the independent state: the generation of "sabras" to whom the government of the day is bequeathing an original sin. "You are a *Sabra"* says Carlebach's narrator, "you are used to such sights […] that the world is split between winners and losers, superior man and inferior man."[59] Finally, the daughter is also metonymic of the young state of Israel, characterized by blindness and immaturity.[60] Addressing his text to his daughter, Carlebach harnesses a rhetoric of responsibility towards her generation and adopts a pedagogical stance towards the Israel she represents.

Carlebach's intervention deploys forms of rhetoric that would be unacceptable in the contemporary Israeli public sphere. The use of the Holocaust less than a decade after the end of the Second World War, and the reference to German eugenics conveyed through the phrase "superior man" was clearly a bold decision in 1953.[61] The same text which identifies an Israeli practice with that of Nazi Germany leans on a South African novel and on the critique of colonialism to argue its case. Carlebach observes sarcastically that:

> [The Arab] is the former owner of this land, who has been denied access to it ever since the end of colonialism, and the end of racist land-laws, and the end of racial discrimination, and the dawn of human rights and the sanctity of democracy were declared in this land.[62]

This citation again demonstrates Carlebach's dexterity in drawing simultaneously on seemingly conflicting frames of reference: the "end of colonialism" could be seen to refer to the British Mandate, whose termination was announced five years prior to the publication of his article. The reference to "racist land-laws" and "human rights", however, intersects African anticolonial struggles, and reflects both how slippery and

how overdetermined the "end of colonialism" had become for Zionist political philosophy. This being said, we must clarify that Carlebach partakes in the very forms of colonial discourse that he disparages. Though his text does not strictly adhere to the axioms of socialist-colonialist discourse, its tropes betray their presence: although the Palestinians have been reduced to "human dust," they remain dangerous adversaries – "this East is dormant," he warns his daughter, "but wakes in its time, without warning."[63]

Carlebach's reading of Paton's novel exposes tensions inherent to Zionism between liberalism on the one hand, and ethno-nationalism on the other, tensions that existed concurrently with that between socialism and Zionism, as exemplified in Gurfein's review. Not all Israeli Jews experienced the abovementioned tensions. Some, on the far right of the political map, disavowed any comparison or identification with foreign politics. This is the salient gesture of the third reviewer whose response to Paton's text we consider next: Yohannan Pogrebinsky – an Israeli nationalist – who rejected out of hand any parallelism, moral or factual, between the Jewish people and gentiles.

Paton in the Service of the Revisionist Israeli Jew: Yohannan Pogrebinsky

Yohannan Pogrebinsky published his review of Paton's novel one week after Carlebach's column, in a newspaper previously affiliated with the militant right-wing nationalist organization, *Etzel (HaʾIrgun hatzvaʾi haleʾumi beʾErets Yisrael*, or "The National Military Organization in the Land of Israel"). At this point, the newspaper had become the mouthpiece for the political party which shared its name, *Herut*. Pogrebinsky was a figure who occupied the periphery of Hebrew literary production throughout his life, as personal secretary to the eminent intellectuals Ahad Ha`am and H. N. Bialik, and as biographer, anthologist and encyclopedist. He wrote for multiple

newspapers associated with revisionist Zionism, penning the famous article, "The Stalin-Ben Gurion-Hitler Pact," which was seen as responsible for inciting the murder of the leader of the yishuv, Haim Arlosoroff (1899-1933), allegedly at the hands of Pogrebinsky's fellow staffers.[64] He saw the translated novel *Za`aki erets ahuva* as a foreign object, one of many damagingly impacting the Jewish-Zionist struggle, and used its popularity to point out the dubious relevance of South African fiction for an Israeli audience.

The Revisionist movement, with which Pogrebinsky was aligned, was established in the 1930s by Ze'ev Jabotinsky. By the time *Za`aki* was published in Hebrew, the movement was the face of right-wing politics in Israel: its members called for a monolithic focus on the foundation and maintenance of an Israeli state in Greater Israel (Palestine and Transjordan). Any ideology competing with Zionism, as well as any qualms regarding the use of force to ensure its success, were to be "unhesitatingly sacrificed."[65] Zionism, in this ideological construction, had at its core the aspiration for a new kind of Jewish existence. The revisionist New Jew was to be "genius and generous and cruel."[66] The political heirs of the Revisionist movement, the Likud party, were to be instrumental in cementing the ties between Israel and South Africa as this relationship evolved in future decades.[67] Thus, while the actions which justified Carlebach's apartheid reference were committed under the Labour party; and while Pogrebinsky, as we shall show, resisted outright the very engagement with South African culture, he also belonged to a movement which came to see the South African National Party as a close ally.

Pogrebinsky's intervention does not review *Za`aki* specifically, but rather discusses three translated books. One of these was the South African author Gerald Gordon's *Let the Day Perish* whose status as a South African novel allows Pogrebinsky

to evoke Paton's work.[68] If Gurfein approached the translated South African text as literary artefact with moral implications, and if Carlebach assimilated it as benchmark for historical comparison, Pogrebinsky questions the very viability of the Israeli reader's fascination with the South African novel. Admittedly, Gordon's novel (rendered as *Yovad yom* in Hebrew) elicits a sympathetic acknowledgment from the critic, who writes that the "tragedy of the coloureds in Africa is indeed great."[69] Yet the remainder of the short review focuses on Gordon's and Paton's translations as a worrying sign of public interest in foreign injustice. Pogrebinsky is quick to criticize the Israeli propensity for identification with subordinated peoples: "I doubt that any country publishes this much about this discrimination", he says, referring to the Israeli publishing industry's apparent fascination with apartheid, before caustically reminding his readers that it is the Jews who are the ultimate victims of racial domination:

> Our own current situation is, as we know, brilliant: We have only lost one third of our nation, six million people. Clearly, our tragedy is unparalleled in the world. And if we take into consideration that another three million are perched on a volcano, especially in countries behind the Iron Curtain, it makes of us a strange nation indeed that we partake in the sorrows of the blacks of America and the coloureds of South Africa.[70]

Pogrebinsky carves out a Jewish monopoly on suffering in a cultural setting where, as we have seen, flights of identification are rife. He denounces empathy, espousing what Michael Rothberg has analysed as a "zero-sum game" in disputes between different communities over the collective memory of past suffering or injustice.[71] Like Carlebach, Pogrebinsky reads *Za`aki erets ahuva* through the lens of Jewish victimhood. But Pogrebinsky raises the stakes of Jewish suffering to such an extent that the very engagement with the novel on the part of the Jewish Israeli is vitiated by the assumed racism of the Other: "Not the Chinese, nor the blacks [*kushim*], nor the

coloureds have ever tried to extend moral aid to us […]. If the coloureds prevail in South Africa, God forbid, not a single Jew will remain alive there."[72] The revisionist reviewer speaks on behalf of the Jewish people, a collective that extends beyond the "imagined community" of the Israeli state (in Benedict Anderson's well-known sense). He was certainly not the only Israeli to entertain fears regarding the viability of the South African Jewish community, whether these derived from the pro-Nazi sympathies of key figures in Malan's newly elected National Party,[73] or from alarmist responses to the non-violent Defiance Campaign launched by the internal opponents of apartheid in South Africa on June 26, 1952.[74]

Pogrebinsky's traumatic fixation on Jewish victimhood as a frame that negates affective identification with any other forms of suffering reaches its zenith in a bizarre turn of argument. Not only do Israeli Jews draws all-too-credulous lines of identification with South Africans, he observes, but the same unsavoury tendency characterized the Jews in 1930s Europe. Pogrebinsky's disdain for the immense popularity of the stage version of *Za`aki erets ahuva* prompts him to reference a Yiddish play that, he tells us, was staged in Warsaw on the eve of the Second World War. Entitled *Shrey, Ḥanna Shrey* [*Cry, Hanna, Cry*], the play apparently depicted Chinese suffering under the Japanese.[75] The response of Yiddish theatregoers in prewar Poland might have led one to think, says Pogrebinsky sarcastically, "that we the Jews are very happy, and that [the suffering of the Chinese] stands at the centre of human tragedy."[76] In the past, as in the present, Pogrebinksy implies, Jews should look to their own: it would have been better if pre-war Polish Jews had been more concerned with their own imminent fate rather than wasting artistic and moral efforts, so to speak, on faraway political struggles. Ultimately, for Pogrebinsky, a fixed and competitive notion of victimhood begets a rigid and competitive literary economy: one where any literary

work is so definitively bound to its original context that all forms of empathetic engagement outside of this context serve as a distraction at best, and a danger, at worst.

On Suffering and Sovereignty

In an astute essay on the inclusion of Alan Paton's *Cry, the Beloved Country* in Oprah Winfrey's book club, Rita Barnard observes that:

> If, during the 1980s, an interest in South African writing was fed and financed to the degree that it provided a vicarious sense of indignation, or moral frisson, in countries where politics seemed less urgent and dramatic, it may be that an interest in South African literature will now be fed and financed to the degree that it provides images and narratives of suffering and its overcoming.[77]

The reviews of Paton's novel presented here reveal the question of suffering to have been central to his historical reception in the state of Israel less than a decade after independence. Who comes first in the hierarchy of suffering? Jews, indisputably, Pogrebinksy might reply. Who may legitimately depict suffering? Only an author who shows due deference to economic history, Gurfein might respond. Who may allude to the suffering of distant others with impunity? Only those who do not cause suffering to others, Carlebach might answer. The question of the global possibilities of address raised by Paton's novel, in a spectacular instance of the reading practices engendered by a construct that we might anachronistically term "World Literature," is never far from the concerns of the Israeli reviewers under discussion who subject it to a globalizing optics of their own. Their mobilizations are rooted variously in (Zionist) socialism and (Israeli) nationalism. But questions relating to the political sovereignty of Israeli society will consistently overshadow these dimensions of their response. Hannan Hever has long characterized Israeli society as constituting a national majority that understands itself with reference to "the oppositional culture of a minority or oppressed group." "As

the hallmarks of a minority ideology persisted even while the new configuration of a Jewish majority in its own sovereign state was taking shape, profound tensions arose almost of necessity," he observes.[78] For Hever, the Hebrew literary canon reveals a gap between the "power field of sovereignty" and Israeli national consciousness—a factor that enables the literary critic to trace the Jewish majority's abdication of the responsibility of sovereignty through the Hebrew literary canon.

Our analysis of the reception of Alan Paton's *Cry, the Beloved Country* in Hebrew translation shows these dynamics also to impinge upon the evaluation of the literary text in translation during the early years of the Jewish state. Where Gurfein and Pogrebinsky manifest diametrically opposed variants of Zionist minoritarianism, evading their ethical responsibilities in the face of the Palestinian or racialized other through an adherence to socialist and revisionist Zionism respectively, Carlebach opposes the intellectual mainstream of his generation through singling out the disparity between hegemonic displays of (seemingly minoritarian) self-righteousness regarding land regimes in South Africa and the highly majoritarian act of land expropriation on the part of the Israeli hegemon—without, however, calling the fundamental premises of the Zionist enterprise into question.

As we reencounter these reviews in our present moment, what theorists have variously analyzed as the palimpsest,[79] anachrony,[80] or elusiveness[81] that they put on display remains deeply engrained in Zionist political philosophy. What stands out, however, as distinctive of the early decades of the Jewish state is a capacity for robust public debate that is unafraid of analogy. Ezriel Carlebach's ability to identify himself with Alan Paton – "a fearless author who spoke up" (*Ma`ariv*, 25 December 1953) – without incurring public sanctions for supposed disloyalty might well serve in retrospect

as an index of a polyphonous Israeli public sphere whose existence in the shadow of the 2018 “Nation-State Law” can no longer be taken for granted.

Notes

[1] For a few of the contributions to the debate on the so-called apartheid analogy, see: Clarno, *Neoliberal Apartheid*; Feldman, *A Shadow over Palestine*; Ghanim, "Not Exactly Apartheid"; Giladi, "Negotiating Identity"; Greenstein, *Zionism and Its Discontents*; Jacobs and Soske, *Apartheid Israel*; Kaplan and Grunebaum, *The Villag*e; Lee, "Beyond Analogy"; Morton, *States of Emergency*; Pogrund, *Drawing Fire*; Rothberg, *The Implicated Subject*.

[2] Paton, *Cry, the Beloved Country.*

[3] Bar Yosef, "Zionism, Apartheid, Blackface." We are using the Hebrew translation/transliteration of Paton's title which eliminates the comma present in the original. We will use *Za'aki erets ahuva* to refer to the Hebrew translation of the novel and the play throughout, distinguishing between them as necessary.

[4] Bethlehem, "Apartheid: The Global Itinerary"

[5] Derrida, "Racism's Last Word," 292.

[6] On the role of the signifier and the history of its adoption, see Dubow, *Apartheid, 1948-1994,* x, 10-16.

[7] McClintock and Nixon, "No Names Apart."

[8] Bethlehem, "Restless Itineraries: Antiapartheid Expressive Culture and Transnational Historiography." 49.

[9] For Rothberg, writing with specific reference to Israel/Palestine, the term "implicated subject" designates "the indirect responsibility of subjects situated at temporal or geographic distance from the production of social suffering," "Trauma Theory, Implicated Subjects," online. Elsewhere, he applies the paradigm to apartheid-era and post-apartheid South Africa, Rothberg, see "Multidirectional Memory and the Implicated Subject*,"* and *The Implicated Subject.* See also Heidi Grunebaum Ralph's linking of "implicated" white South Africans under apartheid and Israeli Jews in terms of "psychic landscapes" wherein "the distinction

between knowing and not knowing may be blurred by systemic silence and silencing, the systematic indoctrination of fear and ethnic chauvinism, and the cognitive disavowal of complicity," Ralph, "Reflections in a Mirror,"164.

[10] Jacobs and Soske, *Apartheid Israel*. 4

[11] See their caveat: "In drawing a comparison between the two cases, the apartheid analogy is clearly targeting a set of *state* practices and policies—not the Israeli Jewish population as a group of people, Ibid., 11, emphasis in original.

[12] Feldman, *A Shadow over Palestine*, 72-80. These engagements begin in the wake of the assassination of Malcolm X in 1965 with the establishment of a reading group on the Middle East initiated by members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). For the radicalizing effect of Malcolm X's visit to Gaza in 1964 that resulted in his identification of Zionism as colonialism, see Robin D. G. Kelley, "Apartheid's Black Apologists," 134. Shimrit Baer draws insightfully on Feldman in her unpublished MA thesis, "Resistance in Circulation: Zionist and Anti-Zionist Mobilizations of Apartheid."

[13] Giladi, "Negotiating Identity." 1445

[14] Cowling, "The Beloved South African"; Barnard, "Oprah's Paton"; van der Vlies, "'Local' Writing, 'Global' Reading;" Van der Vlies, *South African Textual Cultures*.

[15] Van der Vlies, "'Local' Writing, 'Global' Reading," 20.

[16] Ibid., 23.

[17] Arac, *Huckleberry Finn as Idol*; Bethlehem, "Apartheid: The Global Itinerary", 6.

[18] Bar-Yosef, "Zionism, Apartheid, Blackface," 117.

[19] Bar-Yosef, Ibid., 117 and 118. See van der Vlies, "Transnational Print Cultures," 20 on the anachronism of Paton's politics for a South African audience.

[20] Bar-Yosef, "Zionism, Apartheid, Blackface," 139-40; Sisulu, Houser, and Shore, *I Will Go Singing*, 86. We would like to thank David Fachler for first bringing Sisulu and Nokwe's visit to our attention. Both men were key figures in the African National Congress Youth League and important leaders of internal resistance to the apartheid regime. Bar-Yosef discusses the visit of "Zulu guests" to the production, echoing the language of contemporary Hebrew newspapers,

without identifying these guests as Sisulu—of mixed white and Xhosa ancestry, and Nokwe—the first black advocate in the Transvaal whose urban working-class background is inimical to suggestions of tribalism that attach to the undifferentiated Hebrew use of the category "Zulu" to signify black Southern Africans. For further discussion of Sisulu and Nokwe's visit, see Shimrit Baer, "Resistance in Circulation," 17-19.

[21] Bar-Yosef, "Zionism, Apartheid, Blackface," 139-40.

[22] Massad, *Persistence of the Palestinian Question*, 13. Massad uses "post-colonial" as a periodizing term here, while conceding the problematic standing of such uses in postcolonial studies, Ibid., 180.

[23] Ibid., 17-18.

[24] Ibid. For an earlier discussion of the 'whitening' effect of the Zionist venture in the Middle-East on European Jews, see Raz-Krakotzkin, "Exile Within Sovereignty."

[25] Massad, *Persistence of the Palestinian Question*, 18.

[26] Ibid., 25-26.

[27] Ibid., 26.

[28] This balance of forces between the novel and the adaptation is captured anecdotally in the Israeli press. A reporter sent to cover the musical for the *Ma`ariv* newspaper quoted one woman's opinion of the novel itself: "Too bad! They took such a marvellous play, scribbled it in a booklet" (Diokanai, *Maariv*, 14 August, 1953).

[29] See Chazan "The Fallacies of Pragmatism" and Polakow-Suransky, *The Unspoken Alliance* (2011).

[30] "The Canaanites", whose ideology is referred to as "Canaanism," was a political and cultural movement founded in 1939. Its members, prominent artists, poets, and publicists, proposed an alternative to Zionism which evades political affiliation, combining militarist attitudes with the rejection of religious categories and a commitment to all peoples who purportedly inhabited ancient Canaan. See Hever, *The Story*, 239-55.

[31] Am Oved, like other Israeli publishers in the 1940s-50s, saw literary publication as a social – and socialist – mission. Manuscripts were evaluated as 'educational' or 'anti-educational', with interest in them divided between 'national-particular' or 'universal.' See Neiger *Publishers as Culture Mediators*, 258. It is also worth bearing in mind that 'Am Oved was founded less than a full year before Paton's novel was sent for translation. Reading *Cry,*

the Beloved Country's Hebrew career as decidedly ideological is therefore not only a post-factum form of analysis: the novel and its translation were overtly ideologically marked in the contemporary setting, as well.

[32] Van der Vlies, "'Local' Writing, 'Global' Reading", 22. In keeping with liberal modes of reading, van der Vlies tells us, American readers saw *Cry, the Beloved Country* as a "window to a distant world" that reflected conditions in faraway Africa while also serving as a parable, tellingly dissociated from its historical context and thus, as a vehicle of identification on the part of this readership. For an example of such an approach, see Collins, '*Cry, the Beloved Country*'.

[33] Van der Vlies, "'Local' Writing, 'Global' Reading", 22.

[34] Gurfein, *Al Hamishmar,* July 4, 1952. All translations from the Hebrew are our own, NT and LB.

[35] Moodie, "The Moral Economy," 28-29.

[36] Bernstein, *Memory against Forgetting*, 97.

[37] Penny M. Von Eschen records that the *New York Times* carried a letter to the editor from singer and activist Paul Robeson who reported on the strikers' cause and denounced the "tyranny" of the white owners of the South African gold-mines." Von Eschen, *Race against Empire*, 64-65. Additionally, the African American activist organization, the Council on African Affairs, used the press to stress the dependency of the South African gold economy on US support and coordinated a campaign for famine relief in the Ciskei region of South Africa featuring Broadway celebrities including Robeson and Canada Lee who would star in Zoltán Korda's 1951 film production of *Cry, the Beloved Country*, Ibid., 65.

[38] *Kol ha`am*, March 11, 1947.

[39] *Al Hamishmar,* July 4, 1952.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Locke, "Dawn Patrol, Part I", 6.

[42] Massad, *Persistence of the Palestinian Question*, 14.

[43]Ibid., 20.

[44] Gurfein, *Al Hamishmar*, August 14, 1944; Gurfein, *Al Hamishmar*, March 30, 1951.

[45] Ibid.

[46] For a discussion of Zionist Labour movements and their relation to Arab workers in Palestine, see Lockman, *Comrades and Enemies*. We take the term "beneficiary" from Mahmood Mamdani's work on apartheid South Africa, "Reconciliation without Justice".

[47] Bar-Yosef, "Zionism, Apartheid, Blackface," 124. The novel was reprinted five times in the 15 years after its initial publication.

[48] One of Carlebach's colleagues helps us to understand the cultural importance that the Friday column and its writer accrued. In television interview he stated: "[People] waited yearningly for this column – sometimes stood by the kiosks before it arrived to snatch a copy… [Israel's former Commander in Chief, Yigael] Yadin said once: 'if you want to know what the public will think tomorrow, read what Carlebach writes today'" (Gamlieli 2000).

[49] Carlebach, *Ma`ariv*, 25 December 1953.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid, our emphasis.

[52] The seminal novella by S. Yizhar, *Hirbet Hiz`a*, provides an example of this same mechanism of mirroring-as-erasure prevalent in Hebrew literature of the first decades of the state, see Hever, "Minority Discourse." Carlebach is thus participating in a cultural trope, rather than breaking rhetorical ground.

[53] See Crawford, "Biblical Influences," Moss, "Alan Paton," Iannone, "Classics Revisited."

[54] Carlebach's reattribution of "*Za'aki erets ahuva*" away from its original South African context paved the way for its rebirth as a modern Hebrew idiom. This naturalization was facilitated by the biblical nature of Paton's prose, and by the "rebirth" of modern Hebrew on the basis of biblical Hebrew. Elevated Hebrew literary registers often carry biblical connotations. The novel's translated title is a treasure trove of such allusions: "*Za'aki erets"* ("cry, oh country") rings familiar because of Isaiah 14:31, "Howl, O gate; cry, O city" (King James Version). The word *"erets*," synonymous with country, land, and earth, is used with specific reference to the territory of Israel-Palestine, as in the phrase *Erets Yisrael*, or with the definite article in the "*ha-arets*" ("the land/country," meaning Israel).

[55] Carlebach, *Ma`ariv*, 25 December 1953.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid., cf. 2 Samuel 12:1-4.

[58] Paton, *Cry, the Beloved Country*, 80; Carlebach, *Ma`ariv*, 25 December 1953.

[59] Ibid.

[60] Addressing the land of Palestine-Israel, and later the state itself, as an anthropomorphized female entity is a common trope in Zionist discourse. See Hever, "Minority Discourse," Peled ,*The Israeli Sovereign*, 126-81.

[61] Carlebach uses the term *Adam 'elion*, which was one of the Hebrew terms used to translate the German *Übermensch*. As the Nietzschean concept was widely used by Hitler to describe Aryans under Nazi ideology, the usage once again ties Israel's wrongdoings to the historical wrongs inflicted upon the Jewish people.

[62] Carlebach, *Ma'ariv*, 25 December 1953.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Pogrebinsky, *Hazit ha`am*, June 16, 1933. Haim Arlosoroff (1899-1933) was a prominent member of pre-state Jewish elite in Palestine. He negotiated the "Ha'avara" (transfer) agreement, under which the Third Reich would allow German Jews to immigrate to Palestine, as long as their possessions would be transferred to Palestine as German export goods. Three days after returning from Germany where he finalized the agreement, Arlozoroff was shot. For further discussion of the agreement and the turmoil it incited see Weiss (n.d.) "The Transfer Agreement."

[65] Jabotinsky, *The Idea of Betar [Ra'ayon Betar]*, 312.

[66] Jabotinsky, Ḳisṭer, and Markovitzki, *Tagar U-Magen*, 194.

[67] Menachem Begin, the Likud's first Prime Minister and Israel's first right-wing head of state, was the chairman of the Israel-South Africa Friendship Society. Shortly after he took power, the new South African Minister for Foreign Affairs, R. F. (Pik) Botha, visited Israel and reaffirmed South Africa's support for the state. Chazan, "The Fallacies of Pragmatism," 174.

[68] Gerald Gordon Q.C. was a prominent South African lawyer also active in civil society through membership of the anti-fascist and anti-racist war veterans' organization, the Torch Commando, and the Liberal Party. He wrote four novels and served as the National President of the South African branch of PEN. See Friedman, "The Late Gerald Gordon."

[69] *Ḥerut*, 1 January 1954.

[70] Ibid.

[71] Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory*, 3.

[72] Pogrebinksy uses the Hebrew word "*kushi"* for black, a word that did not have the derogatory associations in his era that it has in our own. His reference to coloureds (*tsiv'oniyim*) taking power in South Africa is a little anomalous, unless he is using coloured as a synonym for black or Negro as in the American usage of the times. *Ḥerut*, 1 January 1954.

[73] See for instance this reports in the Israeli press in July 1948 that the South African Jewish Board of Deputies had asked the newly-elected Prime Minister Malan to address the government's stance towards the Jews, "in light of the concerns raised in some circles." *HaMashkif* July 4, 1948. On antisemitism in South Africa during this period, see Milton Shain *A Perfect Storm*.

[74] A report in *Davar* in November 1952, asserted that "like all other… white citizens of [South Africa], South-African Jews live in constant fear… [since] ten million Black Africans declared war on Dr. Malan's government." *Davar*, Nov 7, 1952.

[75] We could not find additional corroborations of this play.

[76] Pogrebinksy, *Herut,* 1 January 1954.

[77] Barnard, "Oprah's Paton," 17.

[78] Hever, "Minority Discourse of a National Majority", 130.

[79] Massad, *The Persistence of the Palestinian Question*, 14.

[80] Hever, "Minority Discourse of a National Majority."

[81] Bar-Yosef, "Zionism, Apartheid, Blackface," 118.

Bibliography

Arac, Jonathan. *Huckleberry Finn as Idol and Target: The Functions of Criticism in Our Time*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1997.

Baer, Shimrit. "Resistance in Circulation: Zionist and Anti-Zionist Mobilizations of Apartheid." Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2016. https://scholars.huji.ac.il/ercapartheid/publications.

Barnard, Rita. "Oprah's Paton, or South Africa and the Globalization of Suffering." *Safundi* 7, no. 3 (July 2006): 1.

Bar-Yosef, Eitan. "Zionism, Apartheid, Blackface: *Cry the Beloved Country* (sic) on the Israeli Stage," *Representations* 123, no. 1 (2013): 117-53.

Bernstein, Rusty. *Memory against Forgetting: Memoirs from a Life in South African Politics 1938-1964*. London: Viking, 1999.

Bethlehem, Louise. "Apartheid: The Global Itinerary - Part B2: Scientific Proposal." European Research Council Consolidator Grant, Call 2013.

Bethlehem, Louise. “Restless Itineraries: Antiapartheid Expressive Culture and Transnational Historiography.” *Social Text* 36, no. 3 (136) (September 1, 2018): 47-69.

Chazan, Naomi. “The Fallacies of Pragmatism: Israeli Foreign Policy towards South Africa.” *African Affairs* 82, no. 327 (1983): 169–99.

Clarno, Andy. *Neoliberal Apartheid: Palestine/Israel and South Africa after 1994*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2017.

Collins, Harold R. “‘*Cry, the Beloved Country*’ and the Broken Tribe.” *College English* 14, no. 7 (1953): 379–85. https://doi.org/10.2307/371472.

Cowling, Lesley. “The Beloved South African: Alan Paton in America.” *Scrutiny2* 10, no. 2 (January 2005): 81–92. https://doi.org/10.1080/18125441.2005.10877374.

Crawford, John W. “Biblical Influences in ‘Cry, the Beloved Country.’” *Notre Dame English Journal* 5, no. 1 (1969): 16–21.

Derrida, Jacques. "Racism's Last Word." Translated by Peggy Kamuf. *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 1: 290-99. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1343472.

Dubow, Saul. *Apartheid, 1948-1994*. First edition. Oxford Histories. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Feldman, Keith. *A Shadow over Palestine: The Imperial Life of Race in America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

Friedman, Gerald. “The Late Gerald Gordon, Q.C.” *Consultus* 11 no. 2 (November 1998): 117-18. https://www.sabar.co.za/law-journals/1998/november/1998-november-vol011-no2-pp117-118.pdf

Gamlieli, Noga. “Azriel Karlibach.” Documentary. *Hakol Anashim*. Israeli Educational Television, 2000.

Ghanim, Honayda. “Not Exactly Apartheid: The Dynamics of Settler Colonialism and Military Occupation.” In *Israel and Palestine: Alternative Perspectives on Statehood*, 97–114. Rowman and Littlefield, 2016.

Giladi, Rotem. “Negotiating Identity: Israel, Apartheid, and the United Nations, 1949–1952.” *The English Historical Review* 132, no. 559 (December 30, 2017): 1440–72.

Greenstein, Ran. *Zionism and Its Discontents: A Century of Radical Dissent in Israel/Palestine*. London: Pluto Press, 2014.

Grunebaum Ralph, Heidi. “Reflections in a Mirror: From South Africa to Palestine/Israel and Back Again.” In *Apartheid Israel: The Politics of an*

Analogy, edited by Sean Jacobs and Jon Soske. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2015.

Hever, Hannan. "Minority Discourse of a National Majority: Israeli Fiction of the Early Sixties." Translated by Orin D. Gensler. *Prooftexts*, 10, no.1 (1990): 129–47.

Hever, Hannan. *The Story and the Nation: Readings in Hebrew Prose* [Hebrew]. Tel Aviv: Resling, 2007.

Iannone, Carol. "Classics Revisited: Alan Paton's Tragic Liberalism." *The American Scholar* 66, no. 3 (1997): 442–51.

Jacobs, Sean, and Jon Soske, eds. *Apartheid Israel: The Politics of an Analogy*. Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books, 2015.

Jabotinsky, Ze'ev. *The Idea of Betar* [Hebrew]. Tel Aviv: Betar, 1934.

Jabotinsky, Ze'ev, Yosef Ḳisṭer, and Yaakov Markovitzki. *Tagar U-Magen: Ze'ev Z'aboṭinsḳi Ṿeha-Etsel*. Tel-Aviv: Hotsa'at ha-misdar 'al-shem Ze'ev Z'aboṭinsḳi, 2004.

Kaplan, Mark, and Heidi Grunebaum. *The Village under The Forest*. Documentary, 2013.

Kelley, Robin D. G. "Apartheid's Black Apologists." In *Apartheid Israel: The Politics of an Analogy*, edited by Sean Jacobs and Jon Soske, 125–41. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2015.

Lee, Christopher J. "Beyond Analogy: Bare Life in the West Bank." *Postcolonial Studies* 16, no. 4 (December 2013): 374–87.

Locke, Alain. "Dawn Patrol a Review of the Literature of the Negro for 1948: Part I." *Phylon (1940-1956)* 10, no. 1 (1949): 5–14.

Lockman, Zachary. *Comrades and Enemies: Arab and Jewish Workers in Palestine, 1906-1948*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Mamdani, Mahmood. "Reconciliation without Justice." *South African Review of Books* 46 (1996): 3–5.

Massad, Joseph. *The Persistence of the Palestinian Question: Essays on Zionism and the Palestinians*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2006.

McClintock, Anne, and Rob Nixon. "No Names Apart: The Separation of Word and History in Derrida's 'Le Dernier Mot Du Racisme.'" *Critical Inquiry* 13, no. 1 (October 1986): 140–54.

Morton, Stephen. *States of Emergency: Colonialism, Literature and Law*. Liverpool University Press, 2014.

Moodie, T. Dunbar. “The Moral Economy of the Black Miners’ Strike of 1946.” *Journal of Southern African Studies* 13, no. 1 (1986): 1–35.

Moss, Rose. “Alan Paton: Bringing a Sense of the Sacred.” *World Literature Today* 57, no. 2 (1983): 233–37.

Neiger, Mordechai. *Publishers as Culture Mediators: The Cultural History of Hebrew Publishing in Israel* (1910-2010) [Hebrew]. Jerusalem: MN, 2017.

Paton, Alan. *Cry, the Beloved Country*. New York: Macmillan Pub. Co., 1986.

Peled, Shimrit. *The Israeli Sovereign, The Novel, and Discourse 1967 – 1973* [Hebrew]. Jerusalem: Y.L Magnes, 2014.

Pogrund, Benjamin. *Drawing Fire: Investigating the Accusations of Apartheid in Israel*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2014.

Polakow-Suransky, Sasha. *The Unspoken Alliance: Israel’s Secret Relationship with Apartheid South Africa*. New York: Vintage, 2011.

Raz-Krakotzkin, Amnon. “Exile Within Sovereignty: Critique of ‘The Negation of Exile’ in Israeli Culture [Hebrew].” *Teoriya Uvikoret* 5 (1994): 23-55.

Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Rothberg, Michael. “Multidirectional Memory and the Implicated Subject.” In *Performing Memory in Art and Popular Culture*, Online. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Rothberg, Michael. *The Implicated Subject: Beyond Victims and Perpetrators*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2019.

Sisulu, Walter, George M. Houser, and Herbert Shore. *I Will Go Singing. Walter Sisulu Speaks of His Life and the Struggle for Freedom in South Africa*. Cape Town: Robben Island Museum, 2001.

Shain, Milton. *A Perfect Storm: Antisemitism in South Africa, 1930-1948*. Johannesburg, South Africa: Jonathan Ball Publishers, 2015.

Soske, Jon, and Sean Jacobs, eds. *Apartheid Israel: The Politics of an Analogy*. Chicago, Illinois: Haymarket Books, 2015.

Van der Vlies, Andrew. “‘Local’ Writing, ‘Global’ Reading, and the Demands of the ‘Canon’: The Case of Alan Paton’s *Cry, the Beloved Country*.” *South African Historical Journal* 55, no. 1 (January 2006): 20–32.

Vlies, Andrew van der. “Transnational Print Cultures: Books, -Scapes, and the Textual Atlantic.” *Safundi* 8, no. 1 (January 2007): 45–55.

Van der Vlies, Andrew. *South African Textual Cultures: White, Black, Read All Over*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2011.

Von Eschen, Penny M. *Race against Empire: Black Americans and Anticolonialism, 1937-1957*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Weiss, Yifat. “The Transfer Agreement and the Boycott Movement: A Jewish Dilemma on the Eve of the Holocaust.” Yad Vashem Shoah Resource Center, n.d.