South African Jewry today is trying to stabilize after two decades or more of trauma and uncertainty. Almost two years after the first democratic elections which brought Nelson Mandela to power, the Jewish community is still suffering from a long but damaging emigration pattern. Violence is one problem, especially in Johannesburg. Car-jacking occurs there frequently and can sometimes be violent. Affirmative action is another threat to white middle-class economic ambitions, and there is a fear of lowered standards of education from pre-primary up through university. These fears are warranted, especially for those taking a long-term view. On the other hand, the transition to majority democratic rule was amazingly peaceful, and the relations between the races are much better than an outsider would possibly expect them to be.

Nevertheless, emotions swing easily from one extreme to the other. Perusing the newspapers, one finds a medical doctor writing that “our academics are fleeing, our standards are crumbling and our reputations are disintegrating. What we destroy now we will never replace,” and, in the same vein, a Professor of Law writes that “the criminal justice system is in crisis. It lacks legitimacy and is seen as ineffective.” However, alongside these negative views, many are optimistic. There is a euphoric sense of accomplishment at creating a peaceful new rainbow nation, and there is the hope that the country can become a model for a successful transition from minority to majority rule. The Open Society Foundation’s Aryeh Neier summarized the optimistic view on a recent visit: “This is one of the world’s bright spots. While much of the world is going downhill fast, South Africa’s impact is being felt in the rest of the continent and worldwide. For example in Haiti, where we established a foundation recently, President Aristide has remade himself using Nelson Mandela as a model.”

Despite significant emigration in recent years, the Jewish Community in South Africa is still an important one. The Jewish demographer Professor Sergio Della Pergola reported at a Conference on Jewish demography, held at the Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research at the University of Cape Town in 1994, that South Africa has the ninth largest Jewish community in the world, approximately equal to the Jewish population of Brazil, at about 100,000. Much of the discussion of South African Jewry at the conference was based on a recent study by Professor Allie A. Dubb. According to this report the Jewish population of...
South Africa has continued to decrease since the writing of the study. Despite large-scale immigration from Israel, Jewish numbers have continued to decline. If the low affiliation rate of Israelis is considered, the loss is even greater. Over 42 percent of heads of households are aged 50 or older, with no children left in the family home, with Israelis now making up at least 10 percent of the Jewish community, while others suggest as high a figure as 13 percent. Nevertheless, I believe that since the writing of the Dubb study, the population has stabilized. Small numbers of Jews continue to leave, but the vast majority of those who have stuck it out are planning to remain for the foreseeable future. Still, a substantial percentage of those who remain harbor strong ambivalence or negative views and a major crisis could easily prompt a new wave of mass emigration.

The Dubb study also pointed out that the fiscal operating costs of the Jewish communal institutions are very high and recommended that the community be more disciplined with its resources in order to maintain their viability. Mendel Kaplan, chairman of the South African Board of Governors of the World Jewish Agency and Chairman of the World Jewish Congress, shocked the audience at the Conference by stating that the operating costs of the Johannesburg Jewish Community were 200 million Rands per annum (3.6 rands equal one dollar). Cape Town has recently addressed this concern by announcing a plan to merge the three Jewish Communal bodies into a Western Cape Jewish Federation. Recommended by communal leader Eliot Osrin, this plan was greeted warmly at the 1995 annual meeting of the Western Cape Board of Deputies.

Fully 82 percent of all South Africa’s Jews now reside in either Johannesburg or Cape Town. This fact is perhaps the most critical in evaluating the future communal needs of South African Jewry. Most of the small communities—which only 30 or 40 years ago were vibrant centers of Jewish communal life—have ceased to function, and even large cities such as East London, Pretoria, and Port Elizabeth are struggling to keep communal activities going. Cape Town has maintained its numbers better than most other communities because of its relatively safe—as well as beautiful—environment and a substantial internal migration from other parts of South Africa.

The Johannesburg Jewish Community—by far the largest in the country—has seen a strong turn towards strict orthodoxy. The Reform Movement in Johannesburg was hit hard by a divisive synagogue split a few years ago and is only now beginning to recover. One very noticeable recent trend, evident primarily in Johannesburg, has been the growth of a Baal Teshuva movement. Well-financed and organized, a number of ultra-orthodox groups including Ohr Sameach, Aish Hatorah, and the Lubavitch movement, have established branches in the City of Gold. One recent observer may not be overstating the case when he wrote that “unlike the Baal Teshuva or outreach Movement worldwide which has transformed individuals and families, the religious revival in Johannesburg is transforming an entire community. They say that every extended family in Johannesburg can claim at least one newly-frum member.”

This is connected to a related phenomenon—the growth of the shtiebl. While South African Orthodoxy has always been characterized by the large formal synagogues typical of the British Commonwealth, the new trend is towards small very traditionalistic houses of prayer. As Rabbi Norman Bernhard, the senior rabbi of the Oxford Synagogue Centre and Co-President of the Southern African
Rabbinical Association, writes: “How attitudes have changed! Shṭiebl is no longer a dirty word.” Most of the “many young people who are rediscovering and reclaiming their Jewish heritage find that interest kindled or advanced by one of the frum, learning-oriented groups beyond the pale of the Big Shuls and the religious establishment. The kind of Yidishkayt to which they are attracted is identified more with the Shṭiebl, so that most of the newer Baalei-teshuva are drawn thither rather than to the ‘Big Shuls.’”

But whereas the Baal Teshuvas in Johannesburg draw a great deal of attention, the non-observant orthodox remain the dominant group. This follows the British model of synagogue affiliation, which spread throughout the British Commonwealth countries. Describing the British non-observant orthodox, Todd Endelman states that “they did not feel any compelling need to alter the public face of Judaism, namely its theology and worship service. Political pressure to make Judaism acceptable to the Christian majority was very weak. English Jews did not feel that Judaism was on trial or that they had to prove their loyalty to the nation by abandoning their ethnic particularism. In addition, well-to-do Jews were reluctant to tamper with established patterns of public observance because of the high status that the ruling class attached to religious tradition in general. The conservative nature of Orthodoxy, however nominal the attachment of the Anglo-Jewish bourgeoisie to it, paralleled the conservative nature of the Church of England while the liberal character of Reform paralleled that of Nonconformity, which did not enjoy the social standing of Anglicanism. Most wealthy English Jews valued religious tradition simply because it was venerable and established.”

This characterization is true for South African Jews, even in the post-apartheid era. As Professor Jocelyn Hellig, perhaps the most sensitive observer of South African Judaism today, writes, “It is noteworthy that the majority of Jews in South Africa can be labeled ‘unobservant orthodox.’ Officially, orthodoxy is based on Torah Judaism, which involves the meticulous observance of Jewish ritual. The majority of Jews who are affiliated with orthodoxy are drawn to tradition, attend synagogue, and observe the major festivals and rites of passage. They feel no discomfort in driving to synagogue on the holy days and choosing to neglect a great many of the ritual observances. Some keep kosher homes, but do not mind eating non-kosher food out of the home. Others may be more or less observant. It is the presence of these Jews in substantial numbers that gives South African Judaism its special character. The flexibility of South African orthodoxy, as it is understood by the average congregant, although it markedly strains the true definition of orthodoxy, may account for the minor impact of reform Judaism in South Africa.”

Hellig continues by noting that this unobservant orthodoxy is tolerated by the orthodox rabbinate as it is “so intrinsic a part of the South African Jewish way of life”—and in the hope that many will one day return to correct religious observance. Hellig reports that the orthodox rabbinate counters the oft-made charge that the only difference between it and reform Judaism is that reform Jews are not “hypocrites,” by saying that, unlike reform Judaism, “orthodox Judaism holds firm to the validity of the halakhah in the oral Torah.”

As Rabbi Dr. Dennis Isaacs, a dayan of the Johannesburg Beit Din and Rabbi Emeritus of the Cyrildene-Observatory Hebrew Congregation, wrote, “as long as a Jew maintains his tie with the Jewish people and the Torah, though he is not fully observant, he is our brother. The portals of his soul are open to receive inspiration.
There is the hope—showing itself ever more a reality in the growth of the ba‘al teshuvah movement and its many adherents who are becoming ever more observant—that his children will receive a more intense Jewish education and will observe where he did not. Indeed, it requires an act of courage by the non-observant to attend and belong to an Orthodox synagogue.” The Orthodox “synagogue and community must keep its doors and lines of communication open to the non-observant. Herein lies the only possibility for the non-observant ever to become observant, and for the sinner to be transformed into a saint.” Many of the non-observant orthodox are beginning to feel greater pressure to conform to orthodox standards. This is a worldwide trend but it seems more pronounced in South Africa than in most other countries. I served a congregation in Australia for a total of eight months over a two-year period, and I did not witness anything approaching the religious pressure being applied on Orthodox congregants in South Africa. This is particularly true for Johannesburg Orthodox Jewry. Judging from my experiences here, I expect that they will complain loudly in private but conform to public expectations.

While orthodoxy is becoming more observant, Reform is—despite some serious internal conflicts fought over the past several years—drawing many conversionary couples. Furthermore, there is a growing unaffiliated population who are no longer affiliated with an orthodox shul but have not moved over to the Progressive camp. While still very low by American standards, this group is in many respects even more alienated from the Jewish community than unconnected American Jews, since it is that much harder to be unaffiliated in South Africa. While many Americans may just slide into apathy, a high percentage of unaffiliated South African Jews have chosen not to participate in organized Jewish life.

The Progressive Movement in South Africa was established in 1929 by Jerry Idelson in Johannesburg. The first rabbi to lead the movement was Rabbi Moses Cyrus Weiler, who arrived in Johannesburg in 1933. It never reached more than 20 percent of the total Jewish population, and as a result of the Johannesburg Imanu-Shalom conflict, some sources place the Reform affiliation rate as low as nine percent. Most estimates place it between 11 and 20 percent, with at least 15 percent probably accurate for Cape Town.

The Imanu-Shalom conflict has hurt the Reform movement severely in Johannesburg. It began when Temple Shalom invited Rabbi Ady E. Assabi to officiate at High Holy Days services in 1985 and then offered him their pulpit. When Rabbi Norman Mandel of Temple Emanuel left the country to return to California, Temple Emanuel tried to hire Rabbi Assabi as well. Rabbi Assabi refused to leave Shalom, which he felt was in the middle of a religious transformation, but offered Emanuel the opportunity to join in. The result was Imanu-Shalom Congregation.

But in 1991 Imanu-Shalom decided to suspend its membership in the Southern African Union for Progressive Judaism, and then 18 months later it broke completely with the Reform Movement. A small faction, centered around former Emanuel congregants, organized a “Temple Emanuel survival committee” to resplit the two congregations and bring Emanuel back to the Reform Movement. Imanu-Shalom refused this request, and a lawsuit ensued. The judge ordered the two sides to settle out of court, and Imanu-Shalom agreed to return the Emanuel building. This resulted in 1993 in the reincorporation of Temple Emanuel and its return to the Progressive fold.
Rabbi Michael Standfield, formerly the rabbi of Temple Israel in inner city Hillbrow, was appointed the rabbi. Rabbi Standfield was already serving as the chair of the Southern African Association of Progressive Rabbis. The congregation—once well over 700 families—began at 90 and has now risen to almost 400.

Rabbi Assabi broke with the Reform Movement and is today Rabbi of Congregation Shalom, an independent congregation which claims a degree of affiliation with the conservative Masorati Movement. Assabi has critiqued the Reform Movement of South Africa, saying “the so-called Progressive Movement in this country has become over the years ‘reformodox.’ In its entire existence, it has neither progressed nor has it regressed or moved at all, for that matter.” As a “Progressive Movement we have not dealt in any significant way with the unique South African situation.” Shalom has attracted the most dedicated members of Imanu-Shalom, but many have joined Orthodoxy or become disaffiliated, and it appears unlikely that Emanuel and Shalom will ever again approach their earlier numbers.

Many people—both South Africans as well as visitors—comment that South African Reform is similar to American Conservative Judaism. Nevertheless, while South African Reform may use more Hebrew than many American Classical Reform temples, it has a very similar ideology to mainstream American Reform. As Hellig writes:

Observers often gain the mistaken impression that reform Judaism in South Africa is no different from conservative Judaism in America. Conservative Judaism regards the halaqha as binding but permits greater flexibility with regard to its interpretation than does orthodoxy. South African reform, like reform everywhere else, emphasizes the ongoing nature of revelation, seeing Judaism as dynamic and growing. Judaism, it believes, continues to be adapted by legitimate exponents for its time and circumstances throughout the ages. This process, once passive, has now become reactivated. It views many of the historic developments in Judaism as reforms that were introduced throughout the ages in order to make the religion meaningful for Jews in their particular historical situation. Thus, progressive Judaism sees itself as being as old as Judaism itself.

The Progressive Movement has a tremendous potential, and there are hopes that a more stable rabbinic leadership is now in place and will lead the movement to fulfill its potential.

South African Judaism stands at the crossroads. Just as South Africa today is not the same country it was 10 or 20 years ago, so too the Jewish community is not the same community it was a decade or two previously. Many of the brightest and most creative individuals have emigrated to San Diego, London, Sydney, or Perth. While this was derisively called “the Chicken Run,” it was in some cases a moral response to the evils of apartheid, as well as the natural desire of many to search for a more secure and peaceful environment. This is especially true for academics, who were able to secure employment in a new country without too much of a problem. Businessmen on the other hand were more likely to remain in the country rather than abandon their business enterprises. But many of the wealthy have indeed emigrated, and so it is difficult to quantify subjective impressions. Nevertheless, most observers would characterize the present South African Jewish
community as poorer and less educated as well as smaller numerically than it was fifteen or twenty years ago.

But a number of these fears have been alleviated by the peaceful political transition—at least to some degree. South African Judaism must now begin to build an organic religious worldview which incorporates the eternal teachings of Judaism into an indigenous approach to social and economic justice for the long-oppressed non-white masses. Jews must present a powerful case for Judaism’s relevancy to the new South Africa in order to be taken seriously as social thinkers and activists. While individual South African Jews such as Helen Suzman, Joe Slovo, Ronnie Kasrils, Albie Sachs—the list is long—were leaders of the anti-apartheid struggle, most of what they did was done in their own names. As Christian theologians call for a religious focus on healing the emotional wounds of the people in the country, Judaism too must formulate a theological response to the oppression and liberation which has taken place in this country. Such a response can easily be articulated, but it must grow out of the community and not just be expressed by an individual rabbi speaking on his own. The Orthodox Chief Rabbi, Cyril Harris, has made some notable efforts in this direction. Since Harris is perceived as the representative of the Jewish community, his speeches have a semi-authoritative tone. While most Jews have been supportive of his liberal positions on political issues, some have aggressively criticized him.

The apartheid era was a very difficult time for South African Jewry. From the rise of Nazism in 1933, the threat of Afrikaner Nationalism was very real. Afrikaner Nationalists and the Nazis shared common perspectives on a variety of issues such as the racial superiority of certain groups, economic frustrations, political aspiration, and anti-British sentiment. While the Afrikaner leadership never entered into an alliance with the Nazis, the National Party was perceived to harbor anti-Jewish and perhaps anti-Semitic views. Therefore, the election of Dr. D. F. Malan and the National Party in 1948 frightened many in the Jewish community. While Malan made substantial efforts to reassure the Jews that they were not threatened, the Jewish community attempted to protect itself and hence avoided raising any opposition to the National Party’s racial policies. This fear of anti-Semitism is one of the main reasons offered to explain the perceived acquiescence of South African Jewry to the government at the time.

Nevertheless, by May 1980, the National Congress of the Jewish Board of Deputies had passed a resolution urging “all concerned [people] and, in particular, members of our community to co-operate in securing the immediate amelioration and ultimate removal of all unjust discriminatory laws and practices based on race, creed, or colour.” As the 1980s proceeded and the expectation that political change might actually occur grew, the community became a bit bolder but in general it still attempted to avoid antagonizing the National Party government.

In the view of one political analyst this approach evaluated “events in the light of their effect on Jews as an interest group. What do political events mean for the Jewish rights and interests and how can Jewish leadership influence events to ensure that the community’s interests are protected?” This contrasts with a more principled approach “that Judaism has a specific message and that it is the duty of Jews to propagate it in any situation in which they find themselves.” According to the latter view, the South African Jewish community’s role should have developed a Judaic religious response to the political developments in the light of
its religious teachings. This never happened, although a small number of rabbis
attempted to pursue it. Not only were these rabbis discouraged by their congregants,
in certain cases they were deported by the government.33

In 1990, Nelson Mandela was released from prison and a new era in South
African politics began. Most Jews reacted as individuals concerned with how the
political changes might affect their families, their businesses, and the future of their
children. When it appeared that the transition might lead to prolonged violence
and instability, many began to make plans to emigrate. Now that the country has
made the transition peacefully, and the government is instituting needed social
changes while attempting to maintain responsible economic policies,34 many Jews
have regained a measure of confidence in the future of the country.

Aside from personal and economic considerations, South African Jews
were greatly concerned by the perception that the African National Congress
(ANC) had pro-Palestinian policies. While it is true that President Mandela has
maintained close ties with revolutionary leaders, such as Castro of Cuba and
Gaddafi of Libya whom most of the world would ostracize, this has not had a
discernible impact on the overall image of the country. In the case of the Palestine
Liberation Organization (PLO), the ANC would certainly have maintained
friendly relations with it under almost any set of circumstances but the emerging
peace negotiations between the PLO and the Israeli government have com-
pletely changed the way that such relations are perceived. Today it is accepted
that any western country may have formal relations with the PLO, just as the state
of Israel does.

This is of critical importance. South African Jews are among the most Zionist
of any Diaspora community. Therefore, a government which strongly supported
an organization completely hostile to the Jewish state would have made it very
uncomfortable for Jewish citizens, and this discomfort would certainly have
prompted many to consider emigration.

Zionism continues to play an important role in the life of the Jews of South
Africa. Despite this, there is a widely felt view that today our Zionism is less
dynamic. This is logical, since there is greater democracy now and an almost
infectious enthusiasm for the promotion of the new South Africa. As local
patriotism grows, alternative nationalist identities lose some of their appeal. Also,
many of the most committed Zionists have long ago emigrated to Israel. These ex-
South African Olim periodically return to their original communities to visit family
and take care of business. Numbering as many as 20,000, these Olim provide South
African Jews with vivid stories of life in the Jewish state. While this undoubtedly
encourages some of those already so inclined to make aliyah, most South African
Jews will choose to remain in South Africa rather than move to Israel.35

South Africa has launched an aggressive drive to undo some of the worst by-
products of the apartheid system. Both governmental and non-governmental
organizations are absorbed in a multi-billion rand project called the Reconstruc-
tion and Development Programme (RDP), and President Mandela recently
declared that millions of impoverished South Africans have already benefited from
the RDP. More than 28,000 people have been employed, four million have been
given access to potable water, and 614 municipal service upgrading projects have
already begun. In addition, children, pregnant women, and nursing mothers now
receive free health care, and three and a half million children are being fed every
Low-income housing projects and other infrastructural developments are being built all over the country. The RDP is a ray of hope for the millions of South Africans who live in abject poverty. According to shocking statistics revealed by Minister without Portfolio, Jay Naidoo, more than half of the country’s 38 million citizens live in poverty, and South Africa is among those countries with the highest income inequality in the world. As Minister Naidoo, who is in charge of the RDP, states: “The apartheid era has left a legacy of poverty and inequality in South Africa. In spite of the wealth of the country a large share of the population has not been able to benefit from the country’s resources.” In a recently released report entitled “Key Indicators of Poverty in South Africa,” it was revealed that in terms of income, the lowest 40 percent of households—equivalent to 53 percent of the population—accounted for less than ten percent of total consumption. The top ten percent of households in terms of income—representing only 5.8 percent of the population—accounted for over 40 percent of consumption. Sixty-one percent of South African children live below the breadline.

In response to the situation, Orthodox Chief Rabbi Harris has launched Tikkun, a social welfare project dubbed “The Jewish RDP,” and Jewish communal bodies have all vigorously supported the RDP initiatives. Furthermore, many individual Jews are playing key roles in the implementation of the social welfare programs. However, there is a lack of any systematic Jewish thinking on the religious significance of the amazing transformation now taking place in South Africa. As a Christian thinker, Archbishop Desmond Tutu is of course known throughout the world for his religious response to the apartheid evil, and Jews in South Africa admire him for his achievement. My congregation recently held a Shabbat Peace Service with interfaith participation by the Most Reverend Tutu, as well as the Reverend William D. Bantam, the Mayor of Cape Town. The Archbishop spoke eloquently and with great humor, remarking that if he and his fellow Christians have adopted the biblical obligation to seek out justice, they had learned this concept from the Jews. Therefore, the Jews were at “fault” if Christians took this message seriously and applied it to the struggle against apartheid.

It is important that the Jewish community of South Africa nurture and develop religious intellectuals who can present an integrated interpretation of Judaism in the South African context. The political and social realities of this country are unique and these realities allow for a Jewish theological response which can be significant not only for South African thought but for theological and philosophical discourse world-wide.

The universities can be a major source for such intellectual discourse, in particular the Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research at the University of Cape Town. The Kaplan Centre, which forms part of the department of Hebrew and Jewish Studies though it is an independent research unit, seeks to promote and stimulate Judaic Studies with a special focus on the South African Jewish community. The Centre is multi-disciplinary in scope and encourages the participation of scholars from South Africa and abroad. It is the only institute of its type in South Africa. The director of the Kaplan Centre, Professor Milton Shain, has recently characterized Jewish Studies in South Africa by noting that, “In South Africa at present one notices two intellectual thrusts: on the one hand an Afrocentric push and a call for curricular ‘relevance’; on the other, a celebration of diversity and respect for pluralism.” Jewish studies “has a long pedigree at a number of South
African universities—a chair of Hebrew was established at the University of Cape Town in 1896.” But given the current situation and the “local context Jewish scholarship needs to relate to both.” In the new South Africa “relevance” has become a watchword; and “Jewish Studies must contribute to other fields and its findings integrated into other disciplines.” These are among the objectives of the Kaplan Centre. Here “visiting scholars are placed in appropriate departments to share expertise with as wide a sector of the academic and student community as possible.”

Many of the other major universities in the country have departments of Jewish and Hebrew Studies. In addition, a significant number of professors and intellectuals in other fields are taking active roles in the development of new conceptual frameworks for the emerging society, and some of these men and women are active in the Jewish community as well. Some of these thinkers have already made significant contributions to defining the relationship between their chosen fields of research and Judaism and the Jewish community.

Now that Jews are free to present their case for prophetic Judaism without an apartheid government’s interference, it is critical that a sophisticated theological argument be made. Only if Judaism can be presented as a religion with a strong theme of social justice can Jews retain their prominent role in society as critics and commentators. It is gratifying to see a number of secular South African newspapers and magazines printing stories on Judaism and then devoting a great deal of space to the resulting debate. But the Jewish Press, unfortunately, is controlled by the “establishment,” and rarely if ever publishes opposing opinions or controversial articles. But debate, if only a start, is essential. We hope that in the coming years South African Judaism will blossom and serve a community poised to execute the social dictates of our religion better than almost any other community in the world.

NOTES

1. See Mandela’s excellent autobiography, *Long Walk to Freedom* (London: Little, Brown and Company, 1994). I would like to thank Ms. Caryn Kaimowitz for presenting me with a copy of this volume, and Jane Parry and Lindi Giger for technical assistance on this article.

2. Professor Milton Shain and Dr. Richard Mendelsohn, both of the University of Cape Town, are currently researching what will become the authoritative monograph on the history of the Jews in South Africa. Until that work is completed, there are a number of excellent studies of individual communities and specific aspects of South African Jewish history. See, for example, Mendel Kaplan and Marion Robertson (eds.), *Founders and Followers: Johannesburg Jewry 1887-1915* (Vlaeberg: Vlaeberg Publishers, 1991); and Milton Shain, *Jewry and Cape Society* (Cape Town: Historical Publication Society, 1983).


8. “Funding of Community Requires More Discipline,” *The South African Jewish Times*, Friday, 7


19. Conversation with Mrs. Marlene Bethlehem, National Chairperson, South African Jewish Board of Deputies, 7 November, 1995. Mrs. Bethlehem is both the first woman and first non-orthodox affiliated Jew to be elected to this position. She is a third generation Reform Jew now affiliated with the Shalom congregation.

20. After Rabbi Standfield completed his term of office, Rabbi Hillel Avidan of Bet David of Sandton assumed the chair of this organization.


23. Rabbi Nissim Wernick, a conservative ordained Rabbi who once served the Reform congregation in Pretoria, broke away from the Reform Movement to establish a very small conservative congregation, Ohev Shalom, in 1991. Rabbi Ben Isaacson, formerly an orthodox rabbi, served the Har El congregation in Houghton which also was similar to Conservative Judaism. Isaacson has since returned to orthodoxy.


27. Just before the 1994 elections one South African magazine wrote that “First it was called the Chicken Run, then the Brain Drain, then Asset Relocation. Now those who are getting out of the country are simply known as Nick-of-Timers” (Style Magazine, March 1994).


41. In particular the Sunday Independent and The Weekly Mail and Guardian. Solly Kessler, “No News Is Bad News,” The Cape Jewish Chronicle (March 1996): 2. Kessler writes that “The Cape Jewish Chronicle in which this piece appears does not purport to be a newspaper, which is a great pity . . . because of its structure as a periodical sponsored by certain communal organizations which pay for the pages they use . . . it eschews the really newsworthy stories, controversy and debate.”