



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

MS-763: Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman Collection, 1930-2004.

Series H: United Jewish Appeal, 1945-1995.

Subseries 4: Administrative Files, 1945-1994.

Box
51

Folder
12

Speakers Division. Seminar and Joint Speakers Division Meeting
of National and New York City. 1964-1965.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
American Jewish Archives website.

The Speakers Seminar of the United Jewish Appeal convened in the Trianon Ballroom of the Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y., on February 17, 1965, at eight o'clock p.m., Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman presiding.

- - -

(The seminar opened with the showing of two films.)

RABBI FRIEDMAN: If we could have the members of the panel come and take their places up here, we would appreciate it very much. Mr. Dickman of the JDC, Mr. Handlin of the Jewish Agency, Harry Herbert, Jimmy Rice and Phil Soskis.

I think that you all know everybody who is up here, but let me just introduce them now in the order in which they are seated, in case you for some reason haven't met one of these gentlemen.

On the end here is Isadore Handlin of the Jewish Agency, and sitting next to him is Paul Bernig of ORT; and sitting on my left here is Jimmy Rice of HIAS, and on the end, beginning on my right is Harry Herbert of the Jewish Welfare Board, and next to him is sitting Phil Soskis of NYANA and Irving Dickman of the JDC.

The chairman of the Speakers Division of New

York City, Congressman Herbert Tenzler, who was here last year, you may recall, was to have been here this evening, but between then and now, he has been elected to the Congress, and so he is stuck in Washington, and his duties just didn't permit him to get up here to New York tonight. He sends his compliments, his regrets and his wishes that he could be here.

First of all, before we go on, if anyone has any question about either one of those films or anything that is unclear or any comment -- except we are not fishing for any compliments -- just if there is something germane that anyone would like to say or ask.

We would also like to hear if you think they are very bad, because if that was your consensus, we certainly would not show them very widely.

We will take a few minutes right now to take any comments that anyone has to make or questions that anyone would like to ask about the films.

All right. What is your general opinion about them? Do you think that they get the story across? How many think that they would be helpful in the course of the campaign?

Magnificently neutral. All right, then. We have to live in our own splendid isolation and decide

for ourselves whether we think --

A LADY: On the part of the first one, of course, it could have been a little more inspiring, had a little more feeling to it.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Yes?

THE LADY: It probably could be used at some of the meetings, but really, it just left me cold, and I am very ardent, as you well know, on behalf of the United Jewish Appeal.

The second one was very colorful. I would like to ask you a question about that. About how many more communities would you say of this ilk still remain in the Atlas Mountains and in Morocco? I have been there. I would like to know if they have been totally depopulated or are there many remaining?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Almost completely cleaned out, the villages down in the mountains. There may be a few left, but those are being evacuated almost daily, and if the people are not leaving to go straight to Israel, they are certainly leaving to come up North to the bigger cities of Marakesh and Casablanca; so that if not already, certainly within the year it would seem to me that most of these places would have been completely liquidated.

A LADY: I would like to ask how the present government of Morocco feels, what their attitude is toward the Jewish community. Would you go into that a little there?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: The question was, what is the attitude of the Government of Morocco toward the Jewish community that remains?

Morocco is a member of the Arab League. It is a Moslem country by religion. The Arabization process going on in the schools all the time, and the Jews feel increasingly uncomfortable.

The emigration is permitted by decree of the King, who has very considerable opposition to this policy both from within his own Cabinet and certainly from the members of the opposition party.

All of the newspapers, left wing, right wing, Arab nationalist, criticize the policy of emigration, and I daresay that if we were to sum it up in one sentence, we would conclude that it would not be permissible nor would it be continued without the firm and direct intervention of the King himself. Should that intervention be removed for any reason at all, I daresay the emigration would cease.

All right. Let us move on, then, and let

I will

me try to give you as complete a picture as I can of what ~~the~~ major problems ~~are~~ that we face this year, and those are ~~the~~ *fundamental issue* major problems that we stress in our *future* ~~future~~ speeches.

As always, I speak longer here tonight than any one of us ever can at a campaign meeting, and so the problem always is to edit and eliminate and cut out and to decide what we can reduce the essential fifteen- or twenty-minute speech to.

But it is not my responsibility here tonight to reduce; rather, to expand; and that gives you plenty of extra footage which you can cut and leave on the cutting room floor.

When I have done with that, you have here this very knowledgeable group of people, who can answer all sorts of questions on things that might come up in the course of what I will say or that you would like to know about in general.

Firstly, I would like to deal with
 First of all, as far as immigration is concerned, which is the main thing that always concerns us, the figures for (1964) were:

our primary
I don't know figure for Israel and other
 Countries ~~reached~~ *66,000*

Entrances into Israel, just under 55,500.

The exact number was 55,486.

~~Assisted migration by the United HIAS Service~~

I am glad to report to you, that in 1964 we have assisted the largest number of migrants from one of these countries in 13 years.

to other parts of the world than Israel was something -- Well, that's higher than I thought it was. 10,599. I was using the figure of 8,800.

So if you take 55,486 and 10,599, you get 66,000 for the year of assisted migration of Jews all over the world.

The main sources of origin of that migration *of last year's* ~~the, so the splan, transitional two countries; one~~ were Roumania and Morocco. Roumania was 25,246, which ~~is the largest figure from Roumania in thirteen years.~~ *in Europe, the other one in Africa*

The last time there was a figure of this dimension was in 1951, when there were just over 40,000 people who came out of Roumania and went to Israel.

In 1952, for example, it was cut down to 3,700. By 1953, it was cut down to sixty-one persons. In other words, when they cut it off, they cut it off, and it's been building up and opened and closed ever since then. The last few years it has been increasing slowly and slowly. This past year, it was just over

25,000, and in 1965 *in 1965* there is every reason to believe that the political conditions will remain such as to *not change, and* permit that number or more. *we may confidently expect a similar, or perhaps a larger number of migrant from that*

The determination will be not, *as we see it* ~~the size of current migration will be determined~~ now, on any political factors but rather *on* ~~rather on~~ technical and financial factors: the amount of aircraft *availability of transportation and funds*

There is 1964

available, for instance, et cetera.

The Moroccan figure for 1964 was 15,672, and the total of all the others was also 15,168. That was a few thousand from Iran and several thousand from Latin America, and by the time you add up the whole thing, you've got another fifteen thousand.

All things being equal, the anticipation is that the 1965 year would show the same or perhaps higher. The only figures we have are for January, and January showed 4,209.

In January 1965

~~There were many hold-ups during the month.~~

~~One of the hold-ups is due to the fact that housing in Israel is falling behind, and so you have a problem of either bringing people in and putting them into unfinished housing, or you have a problem of holding them in Europe.~~

~~The rate of holding in Naples, for instance, right now, which is the largest holding point, is running somewhere between four and five weeks, where it used to be four or five days, and we moved people right out.~~ *Because of the housing shortage immigrant stay in embarkation centers instead of it as it was the practice until recently.* ~~But the decision has been made, regrettable and unfortunate as that is, that there has to be some a hold-up in order to give the housing a chance to keep up going.~~ *With the construction of house*

I would like to cite an example of the close interplay of finances and immigration to Israel

Admittedly it is

8
postpone their
journey

~~So a very bad situation is developing, because several hundred persons were killed for four or five weeks, to hang around a city like Naples is The unregulated and uncontrolled idleness a very demoralizing thing, besides being a very ex-~~
is as well.

ensive, thing. Nevertheless, that is the pattern, and that is why entrances into Israel for January show low, because the eight or nine hundred or almost a thousand people held in Naples, for instance, don't show up on the figures until they arrive.

So the figure for the first month of this year was 4,209, and if it goes on like that, either the figures will rise per month or the figures in the holding points in Europe will rise, and we may find three, four or five thousand people clogged up, which I think would then call for some kind of very drastic and serious revision of policy.

The figure that we are permitting ourselves to use in open publicity is the one that you saw in the film and that you have seen in the first two or three advertisements, that we have prepared, namely, 250,000 for the last four years, 1961, '2, '3 and '4. That is the extent to which there has been a relaxation in Israel on the ban which has been in imposition for the last four years on publishing of numbers and countries

immigration
immigration

USA
1961-1964
relaxation
imposed by our Israeli
but not on immigration date

of origin. *We are not free to*
~~date~~ *in* ~~immigrants~~ *are we free*
 They still have not relented in terms of publishing countries of origin, nor have they relented *to release* in terms of talking about monthly figures. *These two* The only *items we must treat as restricted information* thing they did do was say, "All right, you can openly *But, I repeat, the line is substantially lifted* say, publicly" -- because you know how we have been *may say* complaining about the inhibiting effect of the lack of publicity -- So they now say, "Okay, you can openly say *that* ~~immigrants~~ *came to Israel* a quarter of a million for the last four years." Then *by way of simple* ~~everybody~~ *fact* ~~has to do his own~~ *one concludes* arithmetic and calculate *that immigration to Israel averaged* that that means a flow of sixty thousand a year, on the average, which is what it has been, *this is* and the prognosis for 1965, *perhaps slightly higher* is the same or higher.

IP movement, transportation
 The costs keep going up, and the costs are *give you two figures,* given in this report. Let me refer to it, not now but *two, may I add, telling figures on the rising* later. I will get to these documents that have been *transportation cost: in 1963 the average cost per* given to you. *immigrant was \$259; in 1965 it rose to \$349.*
Now you can see So that you can calculate that there will be *no doubt* more expense attached, either to the same immigration *a larger number of* and certainly to higher immigration. Whether the United HIAS anticipates larger figures in 1965 or not I don't know, but we can ask Mr. Rice that question when we get to it.

All this is under the category of immigration,

the impressive increase in Israel's base of welfare cases.

^{since} ^{must} and I am moving fast, without ~~describing~~ the political conditions or without ⁱⁿ describing the dangerous countries of migrants' origin, and I will not mood of the people inside the countries as ^{all} they wish to come out. All of this we have said over and over again, so there is no point in my repeating it.

The second problem that we ^{face} deal with is the question of absorption of ~~this~~ large number of immigrants, and ^T there are some interesting figures and statistics which have been developed recently, which I ^{could be used advantageously in presenting} think are telling when you use them, not in a boring way but in a pointed way, and you select which of these seems to hit the mark as far as you are concerned.

^{persons} Of the quarter of a million people who came ^{to Israel} during this past period of four years, ninety-two per cent of ~~them~~ were calculated as being destitute.

"Destitute" was ^{in the literal} defined as meaning nothing more than ^{of this word: 9 out of 10 immigrants} the suitcase of ^{possessions} that they brought with them. ^{each and that was all} Ninety-two per cent destitute. ^{to Israel}

Forty per cent of the families that came in ^{who} during that ^{is} period ranged in size from five to sixteen persons. ^{It means, that entire family units,} Forty per cent of the families were that ^{representing three generations - grandparent, large-}

^{parents and children moved to Israel.} ^{These oversized families, with one or} At some peak periods during these four years, ^{two breadwinners - if a low earning capacity, were responsible for.}

The same time, during the four year period, that newcomers

thirty-four per cent of the people were social welfare cases; blind, sick, TB, ~~one leg, some disease,~~ handicapped, aged -- social welfare cases. On the social welfare roster today, receiving monthly grants,

there are twenty-eight thousand cases. Some of the grants run as low as fifteen dollars a month. Some of the grants run as high as fifty dollars a month. That is the range.

Twenty-eight thousand cases means a figure somewhere between half a million and a million dollars, a month being spent on social welfare between the Agency and the Government.

I am lumping together individuals and families.

The total number is twenty-eight thousand cases. An individual might receive only ten dollars or fifteen.

A family might receive fifty. Now, I would like to bring to light another aspect of this quarter of a million, 100,000 of them

were children under the age of sixteen. That is a fantastic thing in terms of the future, but it is an incredible thing in terms of the present problem, because you have to think in terms of what this means with schooling and teachers and clothes and books and a harsh problem of finding funds for milk and everything else.

Still living in the ma'abarot are thirteen thousand people. These are the hardest of the hard core

Who came to Israel, during 1961-1964

Insert

comparing
in
newcomers
for a person
for a family
of newcomers
will require immediate aid at a cost of
But a considerable larger sum, - to be given
among immigrants
of previous years
immigrants
of this quarter of a million, 100,000 of them
Among the
Israel's there
children are a blessing, they will help to build
and to develop the country. But today, these
children, these children present a problem,
a harsh problem of finding funds for
milk and everything else.

cases, who have not been moved out, can't be moved ^{to better, no more} ¹² ^{dwelling, in} ^{time; and now} ^{it is perhaps the} ^{to} ^{to regular apartments.} Many of these immigrants ^{resign} ^{to their lot of} ^{probably, until the day they die.} ^{welfare case.}

Two, - there is in Israel another group of about ^{subsequently about} Of this past immigration, thirty thousand ^{which comprise between} ^{and} ^{individuals} families -- that might be 120,000 or 150,000 people -- ^{who are ill housed. Each family lives} thirty thousand families are living in one-room flats, built on the standard of twenty-eight square metres, which is 280 square feet. ^{our} ^{or first} Five persons, six persons, ^{a room of} eight persons living in less than three hundred square feet. ^{these} ^{have been one-room} Thirty thousand families living that way. ^{stranded for a long time; a great number of them}

And there is some figure which is indeterminate ^{Insert 2} ^{to} ^{about} ^{the issue on} ^{the list} but something in the range of ten thousand men, heads of families, working on the emergency relief, the ^{projects} ^{provide a} ^{ch} ^{family with an} ^{average income of forty to forty-five dollars a} ^{month -- that is a very quick statistical picture of} ^{some of the social welfare problems involved in the} ^{absorption of these people.}

As you see, one cannot ^{the} ^{who came to Israel} So that when we talk about bringing in a quarter of a million immigrants, we have to, also, at ^{the} ^{at the} ^{same time, talk about the unbelievable host of} ^{other} ^{absorption problems that go with that.} ^{here the Jewish Agency} ^{on my agenda}

Item No. 3 that I would like to talk about ^{situation. It will be} tonight is the economic picture, and you decide whether ⁱⁿ

years in their intention in the last year

immigrants after the absorption process

But the image of a prosperous Israel is much stronger, more prevailing than the not-too-apparent problem of the uneducated. Some of our contributors wonder why should they contribute early money when Israel is doing so well.

to or not to use
 you use this in your talks or whether you don't, but deal with it briefly
 I would just like to point it up, to point up the word to give you some of highlights, the major facts.

The economic issue it is
 The thing that is confusing and difficult and the thing that each one of us has to figure out how best to deal with this schizophrenic phenomenon to hit hard on the head is this question of the apparent prosperity of Israel and that prosperity causing our shocked, the welfare cases, the ill-housed, listeners and our contributors to ask the question of the poorly equipped immigrant farmers why must they give money if everything looks so good over there.

There are certain facts, and perhaps through them those we can evolve an answer to this question.

It is true that the gross national product rises per annum on the average of ten per cent a year and has risen so impressively that way for the past eight or nine years, and this represents an absolutely incredible, phenomenal rate of growth, second in the whole world only to Japan.

The annual rise in the gross national product is the most phenomenal accomplishment of the Israeli economy.

The second accomplishment is that the average family income continues to rise, so that now it is approaching quite a respectable figure of something like twelve hundred dollars, which compares very favorably

with many countries in Western Europe.

All of this would seem to be on the positive side.

On the negative side is the fact that the gap in the balance of payments continues to widen ^{previously} each year and ~~dangerously so~~. ^{In} For 1964, the gap in the balance of payments, the difference between what Israel earned by exporting her goods and services and what she spent by importing things that she needed -- the gap ^{leaped to} was \$530,000,000 -- over half a billion. ^{dollar. In 1963} It was ^{In 1962} \$460,000,000, ~~the year before.~~ It was \$400,000,000 ~~the year before that.~~

The gap in the balance of payments has been going up year after year, for about the past five or six years.

Now, it is true that she has been ^{Israel's} exporting ^{it came to} more. ^{growing} Her exports ^{In} 1964 were ~~over~~ \$500,000,000.

But it is also true that she has been ^{Israel} importing more. ^{In 1964, Israel's purchases abroad reached} Her imports were ~~a~~ billion-one. ^{that amount} Part of that represents ^{expenditure for} hard currency that was spent on armaments, and I will ^{in a minute} come to that ^{later} in a minute. ^{this sum} Part of it, however, represents money that was spent abroad to improve the ^{population} standard of living of the people. ~~Consumption goes up~~ ~~in the country.~~

well as There are those -- and I am among them, and *people* as the Governor of the Bank of Israel is among them --

There are those who believe that there is a very serious *and their view is* future economic crisis brewing in the country, based upon several *disquietening facts* things to be afraid of.

First of all, there is *the* ~~this~~ great dollar gap, which carries with it a *large* great dollar interest payment every years.

Secondly, the creeping inflation, which will reach the point that will make *a* another devaluation of the pound *perhaps* *necessary* or even inevitable, and should that occur, *then* that will *crash* the economy down again, *hasn't* and it will have to get started upwards again.

Thirdly, there is coming to an end the influx *flow* of capital which was *derived* the result of the *from* individuals' restitution payments that were being made *to* to individuals. I am not talking about reparations to the State. *referring to German* I am talking about individual claims *receipts* which put in the hands of many, many *Israel's citizens* tens of thousands of people in *large sums* Israel individual chunks of money -- five thousand

Insert 3 dollars, eight thousand dollars, ten thousand dollars -- *When restitution payments finally come, they put* part of which they put into savings, but the greater *and* *of it* part of which they spent on consumption, *into* And when the purchase of consumer goods rises and rises, you run *the country*

into that classic bind of supply and demand; ^{the} and you ^{country} soon find that you are over-spending, ^{it is} and the price of goods goes up, ^{ultimately the country is forced into a} and this leads to the inflation, and this leads, then, to the devaluation.

All of this is to say that there has been in Israel ⁱⁿ perhaps over the course of the past half dozen ^{six} years, much too rapid a rise in the standard of living.

Now, ^{to state this} anyone who says that, as I do, or as Mr. Horowitz ^{does} does, or anyone else, ^{does not mean to} begrudge the individual person ^{citizen of Israel} the greater comforts and amenities ^{he now can} that are available as the standard of living goes up; ^{afford} ^{None the less} but from an orthodox economic ^{the point of view of} approach, if you consume ^{the consumption of} more than you are earning, your standard of living is ^{goods and services is} rising too rapidly. ^{must} Somebody's got to ring the bell ^{the country of the danger of} on it and remind you of that fact, and if you pay no heed ^{overspending on private consumption which} to it but go pell-mell down that road, then you will ^{may lead to another} reach the point of a future economic crisis.

Should that happen, then the picture as it is today would shift very radically. Instead of there being the rosy situation of no unemployment in the country, we would find ourselves with the classic examples of a recession. There would be unemployment; inventories would be cut down; production in factories would slow down, and the thing would grind to a much

lower level of achievement.

What my remarks suggest that
~~The last thing I would like to say about it~~
the rising islands are a "statistical
~~is in trying to put in balance between prosperity but~~
cal factor". But, by learning beyond it, we will
~~economic danger is the fact that even in the midst of~~
 this prosperity there are these very substantial pockets
of this
 of poverty, which we must remind our listeners, exist
 and make it clear to them that there is no contradiction,
 that you can have a country which has an apparent
 economic prosperity, and yet in that there are huge
 islands of poverty.

In Israel there happen to be twenty-one of
 these islands of poverty. They are almost definable.

settled by
 They are the new development towns into which the new
recruit immigrants have been put, mainly into which no industry
little or
 has come, or substantially none, and these towns, *they* have
came to
 no solid economic base, and in these towns there is
 very often genuine hunger.

Now, when our Study Mission went into this
 a year ago, there were those people who disputed it,
 because they said that's not a nice word to apply to
 the Israel of 1964 or 1965. But I am convinced in my
 mind that we were right, then, and we are right, now,
 in saying that there are people living on diets which are
 not balanced, let alone large, in many of these

development towns, where the men are working on the emergency relief projects and where there isn't enough money to bring home meat every week, let alone every day.

And this thing is no contradiction whatsoever, because you've got a perfect example of it right here in the United States, where you have an economy greater than any the world has ever known, and yet the President of the United States goes out and declares war on poverty.

Whether it is in Appalachia or any of the other areas of this country, not only in those twelve states, there are people in America today who are under-nourished and who are poverty-stricken, even though this country is at the height of its prosperity.

And so the person who says to you that Israel is so prosperous that her people don't need any help is just not aware of all the economic facts which I have been trying to describe now.

Fourth, the military situation.

Again, you make your own judgment as to how much this should figure in your speech, your presentation. However, I think that with the amount of interest that is shown in this and with the amount of attention that

is paid to this problem, even in the provincial newspapers of the United States -- and that is the criterion I always use to determine whether people know anything or don't know anything about a problem -- if you can pick up a newspaper in Los Angeles, which has got the second largest Jewish population in America, whose newspaper, the L. A. Times or the Examiner or any paper, almost never carries anything of international Jewish interest, but if you can find in that paper, day after day, descriptions of the water project and the Jordanian threats and the Israeli counter-threats et cetera, then you can pretty well be assured that this is being played up in almost every paper around the country to some extent or other, and therefore the people are interested in it.

Therefore, when you go out to talk to people about it, they are going to want to know about it, and you know by now our standard and classic approach to this thing, that while no UJA money goes for military purposes, it is quite obvious that there is a relationship between the money which we raise for the philanthropic purposes, which then relieves the burden, to the extent that we raise it -- which relieves the Government of the burden and frees the Government to do

its tasks of maintaining the defense.

Now, the essential facts that I think you must be very familiar with -- because when you start to talk about this, the people expect you to be much more of an expert than they are -- they have read something, but they want you to know everything -- in 1964, the Arabs had two summit meetings, one in January and one in September. At both summit meetings they threatened, they fulminated, they said they would create a unified central command so that all the Arab armies would act as one, under one general staff. They threatened that when the Jordan water project inside Israel went into operation, they would stop it.

They threatened that they would built diversionary waterworks, dams, tunnels, other installations, to divert the water from ever reaching Israel.

1964 came and went without any of those threats being carried out.

They had another summit meeting in January, just a month ago or six weeks ago, at which they put forth a very concrete and specific scheme and put the monkey on the back of poor little Lebanon, who at first squirmed and squealed and protested and didn't want it but had no way of resisting it, and the diversionary

tunnels and dams are to be built on Lebanese soil, one of them at a place called Wazani, just a mile and a half or two from the Israeli border.

The intent is a two-fold one. Without getting into technicalities, the headwaters that feed down into the Jordan River, which begin on Arab soil -- in other words, it's called upstream water -- are to be diverted in two separate ways: one through a tunnel, where water is to be diverted off and eventually to be wasted in the Mediterranean to the West. The other, the water is to be diverted off to the East and brought down into Syria and Jordan -- contrary to all of the international riparian laws about interfering with upstream water.

This is their intention, and when they announced that this would be done, and when they twisted Lebanon's arm and forced her to accept these works on her territory, Israel then immediately made her counterstatements, in which Mr. Perez made it perfectly clear that punitive action would be taken against any such conduct on their part, and Mr. Eshkol made it perfectly clear that diversion of the water upstream would be considered by Israel the same as territorial encroachment: If you interfere with our water, it is the same as if you are crossing our border, and our

retaliation will be what you expect it to be.

These statements by the two gentlemen were not made in secret. They were made publicly for the world to hear. All governments concerned are aware of it.

The President of Lebanon is to pay a visit to Mr. de Gaulle on May the 5th, presumably to ask Mr. de Gaulle for assurances that France will put the muzzle on her Israeli ally and not permit Israel to retaliate in any way.

It is not known, really, whether any large-scale digging and channeling will take place before May the 5th, before he gets such assurances from the French. My own guess is that no large-scale digging will start until that point.

If he comes back from the French with some assurance of support, they may feel encouraged to dig. If he comes back from the French without assurance that the French will not attempt to restrain the Israelis, we will see whether they will be inhibited or not.

But the stage is set, and the next sixty or ninety days are going to tell the story.

Mr. Eshkol's personal point of view is one of optimism, in which he feels that they will not do

anything, and therefore Israel will not be called upon to take any military steps.

The posture of defense, however, under these circumstances, must be maintained at its maximum, and the preparedness must go forward perhaps at an even faster tempo, and that in a sense accounts for the tremendous flap now going on over the German business, and, so far as the facts are obtainable, the main items involves are American M48 medium tanks, which were delivered to Germany some years ago and which Germany was not permitted to deliver or sell or give to anyone else without American approval.

And so, Adenauer's statements of yesterday or the day before were quite correct, that the American Government had to be involved in this deal, at least tacitly, in which West Germany was to sell to Israel some of these tanks.

Of the approximately eighty million dollars' worth -- at least, that was the figure reported in the press -- almost eighty per cent has been delivered. What is being talked about is the smallest part of the balance.

Because of the uncertainty and because of her necessity to maintain her strong defense posture,

Israel cannot permit any country which has made an agreement with her -- and there are precious few that have -- to violate that agreement, because then this will enable the Arab States to find new vigor and new strength and new courage to become even more aggressive.

Deterrence succeeds when you deter; and if you suddenly appear to be weak and cannot deter, then the enemy takes courage.

Israel has recently obtained two more submarines from the British, which still doesn't bring the balance anywhere near equal, because Egypt has ten and Israel now has four. But the fact of obtaining them from the British was a fact of political importance as well as military importance.

So it is the same with these American-German tanks.

And so the Israel position on the matter is quite clear. They are not interested in German compensation in dollars for the arms that were not delivered -- "Thank you very much for those paltry few million dollars. You backed down in the face of Egyptian blackmail, Mr. Ehrhardt, and this is very bad as far as we are concerned."

Of course, the Germans have been quite

surprised at the intensity of the world press reaction. You all see in the New York papers and the Washington papers some of this, but it is not just those. It is almost all of the papers around the country calling this a great German blunder. Her effort to build a new image of some kind of relationship with Israel has taken a serious blow as a result of this act.

And so, as I said before, the stage is set now. We certainly have to keep our people informed and wait from week to week and month to month and see what will happen on this.

The fifth item is the whole JDC story, and the story there is, in headline fashion, as follows:

Perhaps, No. 1, in Eastern Europe the program continues. In Poland the maintenance of the open legal program of support. In Hungary the maintenance of what I call by now the quasi-legal manner of infiltrating supplies into Hungary for the very substantial portion of the population that is impoverished and old.

Hungary has an incredible demographic distribution to the Jewish population. Maybe Mr. Dickman can give us the exact figures later of the people, the very large percentage of the total Jewish

population that may be eighty thousand -- fantastically large percentage of these people are over the age of sixty, over the age of seventy, 'way up at the end of the ladder, and need almost total support, and that continues to go in.

We are talking here in the family.

The Russian program continues, reaching about thirty-five thousand families called in the budget Relief in Transit, and buried there in the small print, but nevertheless very real and very important in terms of the morale of the Jews of Russia.

It is not so much even the physical and material goods that get to them.

So that is the program in Eastern Europe that goes on.

The program of the JDC in Western Europe goes on, mainly in two places: France and Italy. The other countries in Western Europe are getting quite well on their own feet. As a matter of fact, they, in their own organization of the countries of Western Europe, have raised some money themselves on behalf of poorer Jews, namely, Algerian Jews, who came to France. They raised about half a million dollars or six hundred thousand dollars. It is a token which shows

how well they are getting on their feet, that they can begin to help others.

Mainly in the Western countries, Western Europe, France and Italy, is where the JDC continues to work. France is full of Algerians and Tunisians and Moroccans and Egyptians and even Hungarians left over from the 1956 flight.

The average earnings of a Jewish refugee to France run in the neighborhood of sixty to eighty dollars a month, and with that he has to support his family. He manages. But the horrible problem is the problem of housing, and nobody has licked that yet, and the descriptions which Mr. Katski, for instance, gave at a recent meeting, in which he talked about how the people were living in Paris, make even the crowded housing in Israel sound rather idyllic.

As far as Italy is concerned, there you have the nerve center of the whole United HIAS -- not the whole but a large part of the HIAS service case load of people waiting to be transmigrated, and you have that other problem of the Israel-bound people waiting.

So the program of the JDC is mainly, in Western Europe, mainly France and Italy.

The program continues, thirdly in the Moslem

countries, because even in the face of the large migration out of Morocco, there still is a population in Morocco of eighty thousand or seventy thousand.

In Iran there still is a population of eighty thousand.

So in these Moslem countries these are substantial populations, requiring care particularly for children.

Fourth and last, of course, in the JDC world cycle of responsibility is the Malben in Israel, where, due to the composition of the immigration that has come in, as I described it before, with its very substantial number of aged and infirm and handicapped, the Malben in Israel for the first time since 1958 has a waiting list of people to get into its institutions.

That is something that we thought we would never live to see, but we have come to it.

A combination of the factors of the type of immigration plus the cutting down of the Malben budget, has resulted in this very difficult and almost nerve-wracking situation, because here is where you can talk perfectly legitimately, without any exaggeration and without any tear-jerking, but factually, about human suffering and human misery because of the

inability to take care of these hundreds and hundreds of people.

What does it mean to be on a waiting list to get into a Malben home? Where do you wait? You wait in some crowded one-room flat with some relative. You wait under circumstances which cause a great deal of misery to you and your family, if you have one.

Point No. 6 is a point I would like to make about this Claims Conference money, which is tied in with Point No. 5 of the JDC.

As far as the Claims Conference is concerned, let us all be perfectly clear in our understanding of the thing, because if there is any one factor which is absolutely brand-new in the 1965 picture, which no one has heard about before or perhaps has not even had the details explained to him before, it is this, and I want to be sure you know the details and understand it.

The agreement was negotiated in 1952 at The Hague. George Josephthal played a large part in it, and Moe Leavitt played a part in it, and Nachum Goldmann played a part in it, and the best brains and talent that we could put into it went there.

1952 was not the end of the whole business, and there was a period when they were having meetings,

and they were not shaking hands when they came into the room. The Jewish delegation came into one side of the room, and the German delegation came into the other side of the room, and they sat down at a table and started talking business right away. There was no social intercourse.

Now, in 1952 the agreement was made, to last twelve years, to the end of 1964, and it lasted twelve years, and it finished at the end of 1964, and six or seven weeks ago it was all through and over and done with.

Now, what was the agreement? That \$720,000,000 would be paid to Israel. Therefore, at the average annual rate of \$60,000,000 a year for twelve years, \$720,000,000; that it was to be paid not in money, but it was to be paid in goods.

Israel opened up a purchasing mission in Cologne, and every year a schedule of goods was provided to the German Government: "We want this; we want that; we want this; we want that." The German Government agreed. The orders were parceled out among various German business firms, and the German Government paid to its own business firms \$720,000,000, and Israel got ships and railroad cars and steel and telephone

equipment, copper wire and heavy machinery, all this infused into the expanding economy of the State. That was one thing that was agreed upon, and that agreement was kept scrupulously.

The other part of the agreement was that over the course of the twelve years, \$120,000,000 or on the average of ten million a year would be paid to some international Jewish body -- not Israel, but "some international body which you Jews can form, put together any way you want, and this money is to be used whatever way you see fit, primarily for victims of Naziism, wherever they are in the world, or the restoration of Jewish cultural life or Jewish community life for all of the institutions that were destroyed by the Nazis."

And so the Jewish international world organized something called the Conference on Material Claims against Germany, making very sure in that heading that they were not expecting the moral claims of the Jewish people ever to be paid off by this money -- just the materials claims, and not even all of those.

That's a long name, Conference on Material Claims against Germany, so in shorthand it came to be

called the Claims Conference, and the Claims Conference had lots of members, a British Board and a French Board and an Australian Board and South American Board, and everybody came in and they formed a board of directors, and they had ten million dollars a year, and every year they had some meetings to decide what to do with the ten million dollars a year, and every year they gave the JDC seven million out of that ten million. They entrusted it to the JDC to spend for relief, welfare of the victims of Naziism.

Whether the man moved to Buenos Aires or whether the man moved to Australia or whether the man moved to England or Canada, the JDC took that money, incorporated it into its budget, and on an annual operating budget of thirty million dollars a year, the JDC had seven million of it a year coming from the German money -- a fourth.

Well, that's a hell of a chunk of money to have to try to replace, and I assure you, this is a very, very telling argument when you are making a speech in the community, and you are talking to people, all of whom sit on the boards of directors of hospitals or old folks' homes or community centers or something, and you say to them, "Gentlemen, you know the problems

you have when you try to face a one per cent or two per cent cut in the budget of your hospital or your home or your this or your that. How would you like to face a twenty-five-per-cent cut?"

And when you talk to them that way, they know what you are talking about, and it scores a hit. What would you cut down if you had to cut your budget a quarter? You have eight floors in your hospital. Would you cut down two floors and close them? What human suffering would ensue?

How do you expect the people in the JDC to make miracles and play God and decide how to cut out one child out of four or one old man out of four or to trim the whole cloth down by this seven million dollar lost? It is a very, very difficult if not impossible thing to do.

And the soul-searching that went into the decisions I don't envy. I know what Warburg and Leavitt and Jordan went through when they were trying to trim this thing.

Somebody made the proposal that we should run an advertising campaign and say something like this: "Each year we have been enjoying the use of seven million dollars' worth of money which is being paid,

really, over the bodies of the dead Jews of Germany and Europe, the six million dead. The six million dead are contributing seven million dollars a year. Now they can't contribute it any more. Now the live ones have to make up that seven million dollars a year difference.

Well, I tried to put that down in the form of what would be advertisements in the public newspapers, and I couldn't do it without its looking too raw, because it is a rather raw way to state it in public -- not in private. We Jews can talk to one another this way, because it is a fact, and I think that that fact has to be brought home at every single meeting at which we speak.

And now I want to come to this seventh and last point.

Because the UJA has been on a plateau of fund-raising for the past five years, I think this is important to talk about also. For the past five years, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963 and 1964, the UJA has received somewhere between sixty million and sixty-three million dollars each year. I am not talking about pledges. I am talking about income over the course of these years.

Over the course of five years, the pledges equalize. All the pledges get paid after three or four years. You know that. One per cent, maybe, doesn't. So with maybe one year's campaign worth of pledges, the total got up to about sixty-four million in pledges, and only sixty-one million came in in cash that year, so the next year sixty-two million came in in cash. The flow over five years was between sixty million and sixty-three million.

Now, a three-million-dollar variation on a sixty-million-dollar base is five per cent. That has been the total achievement of the campaign.

Now, to fluctuate within five per cent -- and many years it wasn't five per cent; 1964 we took in a quarter of a million dollars more than 1963 -- a quarter of a million on sixty million -- but a maximum of five per cent fluctuation, and many years less than that -- I call a plateau. The American Jews are contributing to the United Jewish Appeal between sixty and sixty-three million dollars a year. It doesn't matter if we spend seventy, ninety, a hundred and ten. That is what they have been contributing.

The fact of the matter is that we have been spending between ninety and a hundred. The fact of the

matter is that taking in sixty and spending a hundred leaves a forty-million-dollar deficit, a debt every year that is increasing. The fact of the matter is that the debt of the Jewish Agency today is over a quarter of a billion dollars. The debt is 270 million bucks.

I don't want to go into a long story of that debt, how it is composed, how it built up, to whom it is owed. The service on that debt is enough to cripple you. It runs twelve, fifteen million dollars a year just to pay the interest on the debt.

The debt has accumulated because the program of total, open immigration went on and on and on and nobody was contributing enough money to pay for it. So a few financial geniuses kited a few checks and borrowed from Peter to pay Paul, and we have struggled and gone on and gone on, and this is where we are today.

Should we not have done it? Would you rather we had said, "All right" -- Well, not five years ago, because five years ago we couldn't tell. But four years ago or three years ago, would you rather that we had said, "Cut the immigration to forty thousand, to thirty thousand?"

It's a policy decision. Only take in the

people within your means. We can handle thirty thousand people in Israel with the sixty million dollars.

Nobody urged anyone to make that policy decision. On the contrary, we all stood around like members of a great big cheering squad, and everybody became a cheerleader of the squad and said, "Keep it up; keep it up; keep it up; take everybody."

In 1965, if we don't make up the loss of that seven million dollars and we go further into debt, further than we are going now every year, then we assure you by 1966 the policy decision will be made to cut the immigration.

As a matter of fact, between you and me, it is happening now. It's happening now. In one place only it is happening, and that's Iran, because nobody there is in any danger. And so what happens is that we slow down on the number of people coming out of Iran. That's easy to do, because nobody there is in any trouble.

What do you do if you start to decide that you have to slow down in some places other than that?

On the side, let me make mention of one thing which I want you to know about as you go around. The Women's Division is trying very hard to see if it

can pull another million or two million dollars together. If they do, I think it would be fabulous.

Let me just give you one figure.

Outside of New York City, all the welfare funds of all the communities in the country raise \$83,000,000 or \$84,000,000. We get about half of that, \$43,000,000. And then, you know, just to do the arithmetic, the balance of our money comes from New York City. So if we get \$43,000,000 out of the communities, and we get \$17,000,000 out of New York, that's our sixty million, or if we get eighteen million out of New York, that's our sixty-one million.

Where the \$85,000,000 that is raised in all the communities outside of New York comes from, where there are organized women's divisions, the women's divisions have raised, raised last year nine and a half million out of the eighty-five million, which is about eleven per cent of the money, maybe even closer to twelve per cent. That's fantastic, and so I'm not downgrading that at all. I am complimenting it, and I am saying that maybe inside the women's divisions it is possible for them to work harder and pull up another million or two.

Now, they have taken that on very seriously,

and they have something going which they call Project Million, and they have asked me to bring it to your attention so that when you go into communities, if the Women's Division leadership there talks to you about helping them with this, I don't want you to say, "Wha-a-t? I want you to know that they are making a very serious effort, and they are doing it in very good fund-raising technique.

They are soliciting thousand-dollar gifts in advance of the meeting, just like you do with a man's gift. You don't wait for the meeting. No orator ever produces money. The hard, face-to-face soliciting produces money, and the women are taking to this like the men do.

Secondly, they are resoliciting when a meeting is over, and they don't think it went well down in Houston the other day, so Mrs. Brailove went down, and they resolicited. They simply went down to the women and tackled them one by one and said, "Look, the two hundred dollars that you gave -- what are you talking about? You can give a thousand dollars, and you know you should."

They began to treat it as a men's campaign.

So I want to compliment them for the effort

that they are making in this thing, and I want you to know about it, and I want you to help them whenever you are involved in a situation in a community where you can.

Just to recapitulate the seven points that I talked about here tonight:

No. 1, immigration.

No. 2, absorption.

No. 3, the economic picture.

No. 4, the military.

No. 5, the JDC.

No. 6, the Claims Conference.

No. 7, the plateau of our own UJA fundraising, which we must somehow or other break, and I think that this is the year we can break it.

Now, I haven't talked about a lot of other things. I haven't talked about the ORT, which has got, you know, this incredible network of almost forty thousand students now.

I haven't talked about the problems of the NYANA here in New York. I haven't talked about the HIAS problems all over the world. I haven't talked about the Jewish Welfare Board, the one beneficiary of the New York City campaign that may not apply to other

communities.

The reason I have left these things out is that the people who can talk to you about them and who can answer questions about them are right here, so I felt it would have been gratuitous for me to try to elaborate on them to any extent.

I would simply like to close by asking you if you all know the story of the man who was very much in the press in Israel recently and whose faith in life and history really encompasses in one human interest story everything that you and I have talked about for all these years.

It is the story of this man, Stefan Dornfeld. Well, I see that some of you don't know it. Let me tell it to you, because it epitomizes everything.

This is the man who came from Roumania. He had been in a Nazi camp and had lived through that. Then he had been in a Soviet labor camp, and he lived through that. And then he tried for years to get out of his country to get to Israel, and it took him years and years, and he finally made it, and he got over to Israel last fall.

He was forty-seven years old. He came with his wife and four daughters, and the Jewish Agency

settled him up in Kyach Monya, up in the north of Galilee, one of those twenty-one development towns that I was telling you about before, and he struggled, and he grappled, and he had no work, and he knew no Hebrew, and slowly, slowly, the family began to settle in and take root, and after eight weeks, everything began to look good.

They had a little flat up there. The girls were in school. He got a job driving a tractor up in the demilitarized area near Ashmoro, if you know where that is, and on December 31st, his second day of work, his fifty-fourth day in the country, he went out in the morning to harvest potatoes, and at eight o'clock the Syrians started shelling, and by about five after eight, he was dead -- period.

Now, this is no brass-band hero's death. This is an ordinary guy, who went out in the morning to harvest ordinary potatoes, and after fifty-four days of living in freedom, for which he had struggled for almost twenty years, it was over.

Mr. Sharett sent a thousand pounds to a fund for the family yesterday. Mr. Eshkol donated a thousand pounds to the family. The Jerusalem Post has opened up a fund for the family. About twenty thousand

pounds have come in in one of those very rare and spontaneous outpourings in Israel, because it isn't done there.

Somehow or other, it shocked the conscience of the nation. He sort of symbolized what all of them go through all the time, but it was somehow more poignant.

And it just seems to me that when we get a little bit blase about campaigning and fundraising, and when we begin to take things a little bit too much for granted, and when in the communities they begin to say, "Well, how the hell long is this going to have to go on et cetera, et cetera", I think the answer is that this has to go on just as long as something happens which happened to a man like Dornfeld.

Thank you very much.

I would like to invite questions, and before you leave, as I see one or two of you are getting ready to do, I would like to ask whether Mr. Lesser would stand up. Si is the new director of the Speakers Bureau, succeeding Arthur Fishman. Arthur has been kicked upstairs. That is upstairs to the front office, where he's got more general policy-making problems heaped on his gray head now, and young Si is going to

carry the day-by-day work of the department.

Si, before I start the question period and have the members of the panel participate, are there any other general announcements that you want made that you forgot to tell me about?

All right. Questions, ladies and gentlemen?

A LADY: Is there any reason why you did not mention the education project headed by Nachum Goldmann?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Yes. There is every reason in the world why I didn't mention it. Because it does not figure in the regular campaign presentation, which is what I was talking about here tonight. It might in the New York City Women's Division, and I'm not sure, to be very frank, whether it does figure in every speech, every approach that is made at every New York City Women's Division meeting.

I think the thing to do would be to ask Henry about that.

A GENTLEMAN: He would be better off asking Mrs. Ganz, the chairman. Is it part of every speech that is made or every appeal that is made at every meeting of the general Women's Division in New York?

MRS. GANZ: Yes; it is. Do you want me to

make a statement about it?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Would you please? Would you come up here and make it?

MRS. GANZ: I can make it from here.

We are asking for a second gift for the education fund, because we are building one school in Demona, a \$750,000 comprehensive school, and we are functioning as one unit, the total Women's Division of Greater New York, and so this is the second gift that we are asking for this year.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: That is very clear, and that represents an instruction, a directive to everybody who speaks at campaign meetings in New York City of the Women's Division.

MRS. GANZ: I would like to address a question to Jim Rice.

How would the passage of a liberalized immigration law affect United HIAS?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: I think you all heard the question. How would the passage of a liberalized immigration bill, such as the President has asked for, affect the work of the United HIAS Service?

MR. RICE: I think I should begin by saying that as the question perhaps implies, we are much more

hopeful and much more optimistic that this year there really will be a new U. S. immigration law which would eliminate the national origins quota system. We are optimistic because of the tremendous drive which President Johnson has put behind the bill, not only in his state of the union message but in his special message to Congress last month, and we are optimistic because the line-up in Congress this year suggests the strong possibility that sufficient support will be obtained to get the bill through.

I think you know that the elimination of the national origins quota system would mean that instead of allocating, as we do now, the lion's share of the available visas to England, Germany and Ireland, who waste approximately fifty to sixty thousand every year -- they don't want them and don't need them, and no one else can have them -- by eliminating that system, you would immediately have available those additional visas for other people, who have been waiting, patiently or impatiently, for many years.

In addition, this bill would make it possible for parents of citizens to come to the United States with no quota limitation, and that would result, we think -- not that we think, but the U. S. Government's

estimates -- that sixty to seventy thousand more immigrants will be coming to the United States than at the present time, which totals about three hundred thousand a year.

Bringing it down to our own terms, how many of those would be Jewish immigrants? We can't tell. It's impossible to guess what would happen, because until the new law goes into operation, you don't know who would apply and who would be eligible.

We can only say that probably some thousands more per year would come into the United States.

For example, last year we brought in about twenty-one hundred. We expect to bring in a similar number to the United States. That is part of our overall program, not including, of course, those who go to other parts of the world.

This year most of them come in at the present time under a special refugee law, which was passed under President Eisenhower, as a matter of fact, sponsored by Senator John F. Kennedy at the time.

Incidentally, I just can't help mention that in this connection this afternoon I was at the airport together with some other colleagues to meet a jet plane which came from Italy with eighty United HIAS sponsored

Jewish refugees admitted under that special law, who happened to include a young Roumanian pianist, who has won many concert honors and who is going to try to establish his career here in New York with the help of another UJA agency, the New York Association for New Americans.

If the law passes, instead of having to rely on this very difficult, cumbersome refugee-parolee law, it would mean that people could apply directly to their consulates, to the U. S. consulates in the Iron Curtain countries, for example, where we already have several thousand persons who have applied, but most of whom will not be eligible for many years.

The question arises: Will these countries permit this kind of emigration? And there I think we have a right also to be optimistic, in view of the apparently improving relations between these countries and the United States.

For example, as some of you know, I was in two of the satellite countries last year, in Poland and Czechoslovakia, the first time in many, many years that any United HIAS person was able to pay this kind of semi-official visit, and it is quite obvious, from President Johnson's own policies and other governments'

positions vis-a-vis these Iron Curtain countries, that we are trying to improve relations.

So it is a reasonable assumption, I think, that if the bill passes, as we really hope and believe, there is a very good chance of it doing so this year, and there will be an opportunity for several thousands more Jewish immigrants.

They won't come as refugees, although they certainly are refugees in our sense, to come to this country to join their families and their friends.

A GENTLEMAN: This question is addressed to you, sir.

Would you be able to elaborate a little bit more on the role of the King of Morocco in connection with the exodus of Jews from that country?

Secondly, what should our position be if a question is addressed to us in regard to the spontaneous boycott that some American firms have started today with regard to West German purchases?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Well, in regard to the second matter you raise, you have given the answer. As far as I know, it was spontaneous. It might gather momentum, and other firms might join it. It might not, and it might just peter out this way.

Apparently, the New York Times thought it was important enough to give it front-page coverage. But that's because the whole thing is so explosive -- Germany and Israel and Jews.

But there is really no policy line involved in the thing. There is no policy answer that I can give you. These are individual businessmen who choose to make their individual business decisions based on what their Jewish feelings dictate to them, and as such, they have every right to do so.

As far as the first question that you asked is concerned, Could I elaborate on the position or the attitude of the King of Morocco, there really is not much more to elaborate on than that. There are certain things about this whole thing that we do not talk about in public. What we do say simply is that in his own judgment and for reasons best known to him, he has maintained a very, very strong and affirmative stand.

There is a legal fiction involved, which makes it somewhat easier for him to continue to permit this to go on. The legal fiction and the public position is that these people are leaving as tourists. I don't know whether you caught the sign on the side of the bus in that picture on Morocco. The sign on the

side of the bus says "Tourisme", and this is the public position that is maintained.

These people are not given passports in which Israel visas are stamped. They are not leaving Morocco to go to Israel. As a matter of fact, they leave with a lassaiz-passe, which is a one-way document out, and the King says that he does not intend to stop the movement of Jews who wish to go to Europe as tourists.

Almost everyone else in the country would like to see it stopped, and the pressures on him to stop it are enormous. But as long as he remains in power and in good health, we assume that this program will continue.

I would like to ask Irving Dickman of the JDC to tell you something about a new program which I did not refer to but which will be made public very shortly, a very exciting, new development insofar as help is concerned to Jews in Roumania.

Mr. Dickman.

MR. DICKMAN: Thank you.

I think it's putting it a little strongly to say that it will be made public, because even as I tell you about it -- even my telling you about it is under the circumstances that we want you to have the

information, but it must be clear that when, as and if you use it, it must be stipulated that it is off-the-record material. We will not be able to publish it in the newspapers. Hopefully, we can give an account of it in the Warburg Newsletter within the next month or two.

One of our people from Geneva has just made a visit to Roumania and talked with the officials there and has reached an agreement with them under which JDC will be sending in for Passover something like four hundred thousand pounds of matzoth to Roumania.

The basis for this is that because of the emigration from Roumania there are no longer any Matzoth bakers left in Roumania, so that the Roumanian Jewish community, which is organized under government supervision, has asked us to provide this.

The other part of the story -- and this is equally important -- is that a certain percentage of the Matzoth will be sold to those Jews in Roumania who can afford it. The number of Jews in Roumania has been estimated to be anywhere from as low as sixty thousand to as high as 135,000. There is no proper count. The closest we can probably figure is that today there are still between ninety and 125 thousand

Jews in Roumania.

There, the report of our man who went into Roumania indicated that there is a sizeable number of aged and other needy who are getting what amounts to a pittance in terms of community help, because the community has not been allocated that kind of money.

As a result, and as part of the agreement, such funds as the Jewish community will be able to realize from the amount of Matzoth that it does sell will be used for a relief program on behalf of the Jews of Roumania.

In other words, we will be financing indirectly a community program there.

To cover some of the other small aspects of the Eastern European program, I want to remind you that last year we, under the same circumstances -- and again, everything that I tell you has to be off the record and can't even be publicized -- I won't even go into the reasons for it; you know them -- last year we sent into the Soviet Union during Passover something like a hundred thousand pounds of Matzoth.

Even with a mix-up in terms of the shipment regulations and so on, only ten thousand pounds of that failed to get through.

We don't know how many pounds of Matzoth we will be sending into Russia this year, but again it will be a sizeable amount.

A GENTLEMAN: Herb, I was wondering whether there was any significant change in the extent or the character of the JWB program within the last year or so.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Well, Harry, I think that is one for you to take. Has there been any change in the nature or extent of the JWB program in the last year or so?

MR. HERBERT: The program of the JWB remains the same. However, it is now a unified program. Instead of us having a center division and an armed services division, we have a national services group, and we have a consultants' group in the field that does both jobs.

When USO got into difficulties for financial reasons, they were giving us approximately \$360,000 to do their work. While doing their work, we had men in clubs and located in various communities around the country that helped us reach the Jewish military in a great many parts of the country.

USO found it necessary to cut, and last year

we only received \$150,000, which created quite a problem for us, and we had to retrench to the extent of a dozen field units.

Our field staff that remained had to take on service in the military as well as community centers. We are doing that now under this so-called unified service. We have been helped tremendously by the rabbis of America, who always come through for us. There are about seventy-odd full-time chaplains and about 250 rabbis around the country who are volunteering and are now called upon to help us in local communities.

We don't have all the clubs any more. We have a few. But each local community federation or community center, whichever is able, takes on the local military program now, and the chaplains and rabbis are covering the field for us in this respect.

We are still carrying on. We are going to celebrate our fiftieth anniversary in another year, doing the same two things for which we were organized in 1917. We are still servicing Jewish communities and centers, still serving the military, but under a unified command instead of two different ones.

A GENTLEMAN: I would like to state something further along the line of what Irving Dickman said.

Before I do that, you mentioned here before that Roumania has twenty-five thousand emigrants that left for Israel. I have news for you. This is going to be doubled in the next four years.

I got this information when I was in Roumania last summer, and it is a fact that the special effort that has to be made as far as emigration is concerned will have to be concentrated in Roumania, because they are determined to leave.

There are about twenty-five thousand Jews who, together there with the aged from sixty up, don't want to go to Israel, but the rest of them do want to go.

Now, at the beginning, at the outset, you asked for an opinion as far as the pictures are concerned that you showed here tonight. They are very effective. I always like to put myself in the next one's position, how it would impress me if I was to see a thing like that.

Normally, these are all professional people that speak to the UJA, and they know the story, but the average Mr. America that makes a contribution, large or small, when he sees a picture like that, it makes an impression on him.

Especially do I remember when Irving Dickman arranged for me to see some of the immigrants in Paris, in Marsailles -- believe me, those homes that those people had, that those people lived in, the homes there that you saw in the picture tonight looked like palaces compared to the homes that those people live in in Paris, and that's why I say those pictures are effective, and there should be more of them, especially in going into a new city, where you might expect a lot of people to ask questions, and the picture speaks for itself.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much.

A GENTLEMAN: I would like to ask the representative of ORT to tell us something about the skills and the trades which help the newcomers in Israel most effectively to find a productive place in society more quickly.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Well, that is a short question, which you can answer on one foot.

MR. BERNIG: I don't think you could answer that question by rattling off four or five trades and saying that these trades could immediately absorb people in Israel.

You know, education and vocational training are a little more complicated than just deciding that we will feed more or build more houses.

But we do have programs, aside from secondary education, where youngsters go for either two years, three years or four years, depending upon the trade. We do have special programs in cooperation with the Minister of Labor on the question of upgrading the skills of adults, that is, those who are starting to work in various places, bringing them into special courses, so that in a short time they could have a more firm skill that the economy needs, that they can render and that will give them a higher rate of pay.

Similar skills are given to those youngsters, fourteen years of age, who have quit, who have finished primary school but either don't have sufficient education to enter secondary school or whose parents and the general economy -- namely, with respect to the Orient and the North African children, who can't afford to go to secondary school -- to present all sorts of programs for them, where they can work under an apprenticeship program, where they could also get some pay, at least an average of forty dollars a month or 120 pounds a month, and at the same time, due to a new, very

good law that was passed in Israel, which makes it compulsory for the employer to let the youngster out of work for eight hours a week to a school, during which eight hours on this one day he gets his pay, and by these various methods, outside, again, of secondary education, skills are speeded up in various ways.

I just want to say that I have just come back from Israel two days ago, and tremendous plans are in the works in the various municipalities, in the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Education, as a result of the UJA-Israel education fund.

I know this isn't the proper meeting at which to emphasize that point, but it is all part of the same picture of absorbing the new immigrant.

One little exotic thing, not speaking about Israel or other countries -- we could speak of Israel in tremendous terms, but I want to say one thing about Lebanon.

Our various agencies help Jews achieve solidarity in various ways. For example, there is a small Jewish community in Lebanon, which is an Arab country, part of the Arab League. This is, again, off the record.

We in ORT were permitted to send a

representative in to organize stenography training for the girls there, and we did it.

One of our representatives recently was in Lebanon and came back with a very enthusiastic report. He visited the Jewish school, where Hebrew is, by the way, one of the main languages, and as a result of the fact that he was able to communicate with the children in Hebrew, established a feeling of solidarity with these children, where somebody from the outside remembered them.

You have to remember that they live in an Arab country, which is part of the Arab League, and very few Jews get to them or are in contact with them.

I am sure other organizations, especially the JDC, could mention other such incidents, and these things I think tell a human story, a human interest story beyond the larger story.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: I see there is a lady's hand up back there.

A LADY: Rabbi Friedman, would you refresh our minds on the costs of the emigration of Roumanian Jews? I think at one time it was very difficult and there was a tremendous cost involved in the emigration of Jews from Roumania altogether.

Now, I don't know if those conditions are the same or if they have been increased or in any fashion have been ameliorated, and if you can, can you tell us the approximate cost of the emigration of a person or a family from Roumania into Israel, or into any country, that is, how much it costs us to get that person ready for emigration, aside from the actual cost of transportation and absorption itself?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Well, to take your very last phrase, How much does it cost? Aside from the transportation et cetera, how much does it cost -- that poses an impossibility for me, because the emigration from Roumania -- and we are speaking privately in this room -- is a very costly thing, the cost of which is determined by the Roumanians, and they keep altering those portions of the costs which they choose to alter, in order to increase the revenue for themselves.

So that there is no such thing as saying, What is the cost aside from the transportation? They get the transportation money, too, because the people come out on their aircraft. Therefore, the only way to answer the question is to try to give you a total figure from the point of exit to the point of entrance in Haifa.

This is not counting any costs of absorbing the person once he gets into Israel, but just to take him out and bring him over there.

It is running about \$330 per person, man, woman or child, which is quite an increase over last year, when it was \$250 or \$260 per person.

MR. DICKMAN: Let me just add: We have been doing a lot of talking about Roumania the last few days. The costs involved before an emigrant can leave Roumania -- and again, all of this has to be off the record -- but so that you will know it, it involves something that the Roumanians have established as policy.

Before anyone can leave, there are certain fees he has to pay, including -- and this is the most expensive one -- he must renovate his apartment completely to their satisfaction, so that someone else can move into it, and the latest costs we have been able to establish in terms of a family is that it costs approximately four hundred dollars per family before the transportation or anything of that kind.

Now, this is a very confidential figure, and I will trust you to use it only where you feel that the audience should be in possession of it.

THE LADY: May I pursue that just a little further?

Is that four hundred dollars plus the 330 to which you referred, Rabbi Friedman?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Yes. Yes.

THE LADY: So we can figure in terms of \$705 before you even begin to move the family.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: No, no. The figure Mr. Dickman gave you was about four hundred dollars per family. The figure that I gave you was about \$350 per person from point of exit to point of entrance.

If you take as a fact that the average Roumanian family over the past year has been 2.8 persons -- that is a statistical average; there is no such thing as eight-tenths of a human being -- but a statistical average of 2.8 persons or three persons per family.

Using the figure of \$350 per person, you are talking about something around a thousand dollars per family, of which four hundred is the internal cost that Mr. Dickman is talking about, and the balance is transportation and en route costs.

There has been no amelioration of the conditions up to now. Payment of all sorts of taxes,

payments of all the municipal fees, and payment of the apartment renovation, payment of schooling which has been achieved by minor children -- the state insists upon being paid back for that.

All those fees and payments still remain. Therefore, it is just as -- You see, what makes an expert an expert is the fact that he disagrees with another expert, and what was going on up here was a kind of reshuffling of these figures.

I think you use as a figure this thousand dollars or \$1,050 per family from point of exit to point of entrance, and you have a very accurate representation, I think.

Before we break up, before we take the last one or two questions, I simply want to make reference to the material we have given you in these folders. Some of the speeches in there are good, some of them are medium. All of them contain information that is valuable.

This book is a fantastic document. It is a two-year prognosis of the costs of absorption of the people, broken down item by item, and there are exact costs in here for everything from the first meal they get when they land at Lydda Airport, which costs

eighteen cents per person, to the larger costs of housing and farms and everything else.

Now, serious people will try to find the time to study this, and I assume you are all serious people, so that I would like to recommend this to you as well as everything else that is in that pamphlet.

Mr. Handlin of the Jewish Agency.

MR. HANDLIN: I would just like to earn my petty cash expenses for coming here tonight by saying one thing.

The cessation, the ending of reparations payments under the 1952 Luxembourg agreement also seriously affects the budget of the Jewish Agency. Herb spoke about the seven million dollars that the JDC had been receiving annually for its budget from German claims money. The Jewish Agency had in its budget \$15,000,000, the bulk of which was used for relief operations of the Jewish Agency, that is to say, projects within the general scope and framework of the Jewish Agency's program in Israel.

So you can fairly say that the Luxembourg money, the stoppage of the funds under the Luxembourg agreement will have a serious effect not only on the JDC but also on the budgetary structure and the future needs of the

Jewish Agency.

A GENTLEMAN: When will that take place?

MR. HANDLIN: The last payments under the Luxembourg agreement are in this current year, that is, they finish in 1964. They are in fact completed.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: And to add to it, Mr. Rice of the HIAS would like to report on the effect that that has on their income as well.

MR. RICE: Thank you, Herb.

You heard in Herb's opening remarks the fact that last year we resettled some ten thousand or 10,600 people. Our expectation this year is that we will be called upon to settle about ten per cent more, something between 11,500 and 12,000 persons. That is predicated on a budget of about two and a half million dollars, a little less than our budget last year.

Last year, we had \$425,000 from claims conference money, and that amount was, of course, the last one that we shall have received.

We are confronted with helping more people to resettle this year with a loss of something like seventeen per cent of our total income.

We have been unable to completely bridge that gap, despite very drastic cuts in every possible area.

Our present budget figures, by the way, are a little different than what may be suggested in the National UJA Budget Book, which is part of your kit.

I think it only fair to call it to your attention that in that budget we are listed for a figure of six hundred thousand dollars.

The decision at the present time, possibly subject to some small adjustments, will be much closer to four hundred thousand dollars, which is the same as we received last year, and we therefore believe that our deficit as of the present time will be somewhere in the area of \$250,000, which suggests strongly that we may be faced almost certainly before the end of the year with the necessity of making the kind of agonizing decisions that Herb referred to, as to which refugees we will leave behind who have visas for the United States or Canada or Australia, and which ones we will be able to move.

One final word: In my comments before about the new U. S. immigration law, none of the increased immigration that we would bring is included in our present estimates.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: So it can only get worse, not better.

The one person from whom we have not heard up here has asked to make one comment, this evening, and that is Mr. Soskis of the NYANA.

MR. SOSKIS: I talked with some of you in the last few days, and have given you some figures, and you may be confused by some figures which Mr. Rice gave you when he said that the United HIAS Service will bring in 2,100 people.

I have told you that the NYANA, which is the Jewish Agency operating in Metropolitan New York, serves about five thousand people a year, served that number in 1964 and will serve a similar number in 1965. Of that number of five thousand people, between three thousand and thirty-five hundred are brand-new arrivals. Most of them are from Eastern European countries.

The reason that you get certain discrepancies in figures is because there are people who arrive in the United States, and a majority of them settle in New York City, where the largest concentration of Jews live. They arrive here independently, that is, they are helped by relatives or by friends to get here, because they are able to secure quota numbers to come in to the United States.

Those people also turn to NYANA for help.

For example, there has been an increasing number of individuals who come from South America. They don't require a great deal of relief, but they require services or they would become relief clients right here in New York City.

What we use the UJA funds for NYANA is to help those kinds of people, as well as from other lands, other than Eastern Europe, to get settled, by getting them jobs and by getting them training and getting them into houses where they are able to get along in a few months on their own.

Now, Rabbi Friedman talked about increased costs. The increased costs also apply in New York City, where most of us live, and we all know what happens, especially in increases in rental.

It costs about twelve hundred dollars today to settle an average family of four in a period of two months here in the State of New York. Half of that goes for one month's rent, eighty-five dollars, which you will admit is very modest; eighty-five dollars for security deposit, which is required almost universally now, and a few hundred dollars for very modest furnishings. The balance goes for some essentials in clothing, medical care, money to buy food until the

individual starts earning his own salary and so on.

So these costs have been going up steadily in the last few years and now average about twelve hundred dollars per family.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Thank you very much, Phil.

There were one or two hands up for the last couple of questions, and we will take them now.

A LADY: Rabbi Friedman, is there any likelihood of the extension of German reparations payments in some form?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: I don't think so. In my judgment, no.

You are not talking about restitution payments to individuals. You are talking about this general reparations agreement. In my judgment, no.

MR. HANDLIN: There is a new agreement being worked on with regard to the people who came out of Eastern Europe after 1953. It won't affect the budget.

THE LADY: Was that a new agreement with respect to individuals?

RABBI FRIEDMAN: Yes, to embrace people who came out of Eastern Europe, Russia, Poland, after 1953, which was the cut-off date for registration. They couldn't apply before the cut-off date, because

They were isolated in Eastern Europe, cut off.

That's the essentials of it. But it is for individuals.

THE LADY: Concerning NYANA, are the immigrants in the United States generally well settled or do they continue to need assistance for a number of years once they are here?

MR. SOSKIS: I wish we had the Times. There is really a remarkable story. They make a remarkable adjustment, even those who had a number of problems, because of the services that are available.

The average time a family requires help is from two to three months. The number of families who stay on and require intensive help beyond six months is relatively small. But the group between three months and six months, two-thirds of them fall into the category which Rabbi Friedman described as social welfare cases. They are problems of health, the aged and so forth, and it is only because of certain services that are available, for example, a sheltered workshop maintained by NYANA with UJA funds, that some of these services can be supplied.

RABBI FRIEDMAN: I think that you have been a very, very good audience. I would like to thank you and the panel for coming. (Applause)

JOINT SPEAKERS DIVISION MEETING

OF NATIONAL AND NEW YORK CITY

UJA

Americana Hotel
Seventh Avenue and 53rd Street
New York, N.Y.,
January 28, 1964 - 8 P.M.
Georgian A Room.

Chairman: Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman

**Co-Chairman: Louis Broido
Herbert Tenzer**

Director of Speakers: Arthur Fishzohn

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I think that we are all seated. I think we are unexpectedly full in the room. We thought there would be some considerable fall-off due to the weather. It is good that that is not the case and we will try this evening to have a rather slow, leisurely, we hope, detailed penetration of this story and because we didn't want to try to do everything in one evening, as we have done up to now and because we wanted to try to do this thing in a slow, easy, leisurely fashion, we have split the speakers' presentations this year into three parts. This evening I will spend with you. On a subsequent evening, Tuesday, the 4th of February, Mr. Moe Leavitt of the JDC will spend the whole evening with you. On a still subsequent evening on a week later, Tuesday, February 11th, Mr. Gottlieb Hammer of the Jewish Agency will spend the whole evening with you. The point was in splitting it this way in thirds it might take three evenings, but the subject matter deserves it and you deserve it because if you become as well equipped as it is humanly possible for you to become then you tell the story that much better and the whole cause benefits.

We have with us this evening two gentlemen very

prominent in the New York City campaign, co-chairmen of the Speakers Bureau of New York City. I think you know them both. They are here with us. On my extreme left is Mr. Louis Broido and sitting next to him is Mr. Herbert Tenzer. I have just told you that they are co-chairmen of the Speakers Bureau of the New York City campaign. That's the capacity in which you see them here, but you know them in a dozen other capacities. My Broido is a commissioner of the City of New York, an important person in commerce in this city, one of the key figures in the inner structure of the New York City UJA. Mr. Tenzer is an important lawyer and real estate person for 20 years was chairman of the Board of Bartons Candy. I picked that out of about 50 other things that show on his biography. The fact is that here are two of the most dedicated and capable lay leaders of the tremendous New York City campaign. They are sparing their evening to spend it here with us to share experiences and to participate later in a question and answer period which I hope will emerge. On my right, of course, as you know is Henry Bernstein the executive vice president of the New York City UJA and well known to not just the New York speakers who are here but the national speakers because Henry is a

member of the Executive Committee of the National UJA and has been on the scene long enough to be recognized by the oldest among us, among you (Laughter).

A VOICE: He's not this old.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, he's not that old, he's just been in service that long. For those of you who are of the New York campaign and not the national campaign and who might not know the gentleman on my right, he's old and he has been with us for a long time (Laughter). That's Arthur Fishzohn, the chairman of the National Speakers Bureau. You see, it goes to show you, out of the New York City public school can come something. Don't let anybody tell you it can't.

Arthur is head of the National Speakers Bureau. Mrs. Warner is somewhere here, Florence stand up, please. (Applause) Mrs. Warner, director of the New York City Speakers Bureau.

I think that's all the formality that we'll indulge in this evening. I would like, as I said, in a slow, delicate and fairly deliberate way to try to dissect the bones of this 1964 story. Those of you, by the way, on the New York City speakers' list have already received, I think yesterday or the day before from

New York City a mimeographed version, pamphlet or whatever you want to call it of the 1964 story. Those of you on the national speakers' list will receive yours in a very few days. In addition, we'll be sending to you, to make sure you have it and if we duplicate it, give the copy to someone else, the budget book which was distributed a month ago at the December conference. If you have it, fine, if you haven't got it you will get a copy of it. Secondly, a copy of a pamphlet that we printed based on a report made by Ruth Gruberg. If you haven't got that it will be a valuable ally. Thirdly, some mimeographed speeches of Mr. Sharrett of the Jewish Agency and Mr. Jordan of the JDC which were made at the December conference.

Lastly, if it turns out to be any good, a transcript of this thing tonight if we can put it in some kind of a systematic order and if it turns out to be distributable. So, this is the written material that you will get. When I say dissect the 1964 story let me tell you first of all that a policy decision was made in regard to this campaign that we would attempt to unfold, to develop during this campaign the story of the crises in absorption of the people who have come into Israel in previous years who are not fully absorbed and

whose story we have not fully told.

In the campaign of 1963, '62, '61 we did not do that. In those three years we were running our campaign, you were telling the story of it, almost exclusively on the high emotional drama and important historic fact of a rising curve in the migration and we kept talking about rescue, rescue, rescue, rescue. It was true. I would like to remind you of the figures; that in 1961, 47,000 people came into Israel. In 1962, 61,000. In 1963, 65,000; constantly rising curve of immigration which captured all of our attention and our imagination. This is what we concentrated on because it was a sharp departure from the year immediately prior to that, 1960, the migration had been about 27,000. So when it jumped from 27 to 47, then 61, then 65 we knew we were on a curve up and that's what we spoke about. When we told the stories of how the people were coming out of Rumania and the details of the stories and those stories became well known and we told them carefully, we told them under security conditions, no leaks took place in the press, there was a very substantial degree of self-censorship in the American community which is to the credit of all of the newspaper people, to the credit of all of the managers of meetings,

the organizers, the secretaries and the people who were responsible for the security, they all did a good job.

If you add up those figures of those four years which I have just given you you will find that I have talked about 200,000 people in a quick breath. 1960, '61, '62, '63 was 200,000 people. We never took the time to go fully and in detail into the story of what was happening to those people in Israel. We dropped them on the beach, we did in our speeches. We spoke about the rescue, we talked about other things, too, you remember we talked about security during all those years, we talked about the Arab problem, we talked about water, we talked about many things, but in terms of the human needs of the people who were dropped on the beach we dropped them there in our speeches. I am saying it this carefully in order to point out the fact that now in 1964 we have made a policy decision, after long and hard and serious arguments in Jerusalem and in New York last October and November that we would do the following; that in the 1964 campaign we would start to tell the story of the problems of these people who have not been fully and properly and thoroughly absorbed in Israel.

I would like to start with that. I have

taken, in my own scheme of things and put down five categories of problems which I think need exposing to the public eye through an understanding interpreter, which each of you must become. There is, first of all, the problem of the people still living in the Ma' Abarot. It may come as a shock to you to know that there are still some people living in those transit camps. When we first started to discuss this in Israel, in the mission of last October there were tremendous repercussions and immediate refutations in the press in Israel. The Minister of Housing said that there are no Ma' Abarot. They are all cleaned up. Flatly, he wants to say that: Other minutes say: "It is true there may be some, there are just a few, they are nasty people, they don't want to move, they are the hard core cases and let them rot there."

And other people said "Well, yes, it is true but let's sweep the whole thing under the rug. Why bring it up? It is an unpleasant business. So that in a country of two and a quarter million there are some few thousands living in these terrible villages and shanty huts. Is this something to make a fuss about?"

Well, I think it is something to describe, if not to make a fuss about. There are living in these

tin shacks, huts, cardboard, bedonville as the French call them, Hoovervilles as we used to call them during the depression days, 15,000 people. 15,000 people may be nothing in terms of large statistics, but 15,000 people are human, who live in mud and muck and misery with no water, no electricity, no sanitary facilities and there are 15,000 people who have to be pulled out. What they are living in has to be burned down and destroyed as thousands of other huts were, releasing and liberating scores of thousands of people previously and if we are down to the last 15,000 then let's face it, say it publicly, make a tremendous effort to liquidate them and not just wash it under the rug and not just ignore it and not just forget it. I'm not going to bother to go into the costs of this thing. We have all the costs. I would like to make reference to the fact that you will sometimes see me referring to a document which is not for publication yet. This is a document called "The dimensions of absorption, a study of needs and responsibilities prepared at the request of the treasurer of the Jewish Agency."

At the moment this is private and restricted. It is being worked over and when it is finally in form to be published it will be published and distributed.

The facts and figures here are irrefutable.

You also will see me referring from time to time to a precis of this document. Which is this 10 or 11 pieces of paper and these are the raw figures. This is the statistical abstract of that which was prepared in our office by Mr. Tabatchnik in a brilliant job of extrapolation from pounds to dollars, from single figures to total figures and back to single figures. This is for publication because this is ours. If we decide that we will publish it we will publish it and put it in your hands. You have to be statisticians to know how to use it. I will refer to it from time to time for those salient figures which you and I can use in our daily speeches.

Problem number 1 therefore is the problem of the people, still 15,000 living in the Ma' Abarot from previous years of migration. Problem number 2 is what I call the problem of the underhoused, the underhoused. This involves approximately 30,000 families. Here is how they are broken down. There are approximately 20,000 families who came to Israel and are living in houses which were built prior to 1954 in sizes ranging from 240 square feet to 400 square feet. The sizes of these families are four, five and six persons living in 240 square feet, that's 25 by 10. You all just have

to take and visualize the size of your living room or the size of your bedroom or the size of your dining room, what is 24 by 10? That's the whole family living, eating, sleeping, the washing facilities, toilet facilities if they are lucky enough to be inside, everything goes on in that 240 square feet.

There are 20,000 families living in space like that which is now 10 years old. Therefore, it's not only small but it is decrepit and it is broken and it is degenerated and it's deteriorated. They have got a roof over their heads but they are underhoused, they are ill housed, or inadequately housed, use any phrase you want.

Secondly, there is a group of 10,000 families living in asbestos huts, as they are called in Israel, built since 1957 in sizes varying from 190 square feet to 440 square feet. Asbestos hut in Israel building terms means a structure built out of asbestos, which is the best I can describe it, three-quarter inch plaster board. If you know what that means in American building terms. It is not intended for permanent use and yet many of them have been occupied now for six, seven, eight years. They are reaching the limit of their usability. There may be two, three more years of use

in those structures. There are 10,000 families living in that. So the 20,000 and the 10,000 make up these 30,000 families. When we talk about people living in that space I think you have to make quite clear by the graphic use of your own imagination the tensions that exist. You put six people together in that kind of small space and you have the ingredients for all kinds of social and familial explosions. You very often have three generations living in the one room. The grand parents and the parents and the children. I don't have to tell you the sparks that emerge from that kind of a situation. You have no privacy for the late teenager or the early 20-year-old person who is trying to live in that setup and who, therefore, doesn't live in it but runs away from it. You have no room in that place for a school-aged child to sit in a corner and do homework privately, so you have everybody shushing everybody else to give Dan a place to do his work, or David or Shul or Yungel. Then you say, send the kid out on to the terrace but the old grandfather sits out on the terrace and the dining room is on the terrace, because that's the only place you can put it. Pretty soon the whole thing explodes, everybody yells at everybody else and half the members of the family are

out in the street before you know. You may say "Well, this goes on all over the world." Sure it does, I'm not trying to say this is peculiar, unique, special. The fact is this is happening now with people who are living this way for whom we want something better. The way that we can try to point out to our listeners that we want something better is to describe what is the worst. So, this is the problem really of social explosiveness, personal friction and human misery in terms of the housing. That's the second item.

Number 1 was the Ma' Abarot and that's beyond all words. Number 2 this great bulk of people, the 30,000 families might well comprise somewhere between 150,000 and close to 200,000 people in that second category of problems called the underhoused.

The third category of things that I have tried to describe is the problem of the teenager, or the educational problem, if you want to call it that. I can't go into the whole thing here now, but all of you are aware of the fact that something is brewing within the UJA family with regard to this problem of education and when we are ready to come out with it we will, so that I can't go into the whole thing now except to remind you of a couple of basic facts.

In Israel secondary education is neither free nor useful. This means that large numbers of boys and girls from the age of 14 to 18, when they finish primary school and until they go into the army, wander around in a lost world with opportunities relatively closed to them. Those who have no school to go to, and that's a very, very large percentage and have no jobs because they do not have the skills for the jobs and for unskilled labor they are not needed because there are older men, family breadwinners who need the unskilled work, so they wander around fairly well unoccupied, fairly well unemployed, fairly well victims for creating trouble or being given trouble, with no homes to go to in the sense that the home is not a place to which the teenagers can repair for comfort, socializing, friendship and gatherings and no outside facilities of any great numbers at all such as use the clubs or community centers or public facilities and, therefore, they are locked in with almost no alternatives, except to wander around on the streets in packs and they do. If you say "This sounds familiar," certainly it does because all social problems all over the world are familiar and are red out of the same cause. It is our job to point out to many people who have no notation at

all that this exists in Israel. It might not surprise anybody that this exists in certain parts of New York, but it would surprise a lot of your listeners to know that this exists in Israel. They don't expect it, they are not prepared for it. I think you ought to tell them.

A couple of interesting paragraphs here that I would like to read to you. This is called juvenile delinquency.

"No wonder that youngsters emerging from poor, crowded homes into unfamiliar environments without proper education and no positive recreational facilities turn to destructive activities such as breaking windows, petty thieving, outbreaks in movie houses. According to the police chief at Natanya" -- I don't know how many of you know Israel, this is a pretty nice place, this is not some slum -- "Most of the offenders are youngsters up to the age of 17 and most of the cases occur in nurseries and kindergartens from which toys are stolen. Some of the youngsters had never had any toys in their own childhood, they explained." By the way you know that one of the great problems here in New York is toy stealing. Same thing, toy snatching.

On the part of the kids who don't have any.

That's what they go for. When you get up to the 17 year age, the toy is the bicycle that's stolen."

Same story was reported by the police in Kasoor where some 15 to 20 youngsters caused trouble, particularly toy snatching during vacatime time even in Dimona which has work and better opportunities for recreation juvenile delinquency rose this year by 150 per cent. It takes the form of outbreaks, stealing, rape, prostitution, even by very young girls. According to the police more crime prevention work among the youth is a must. At present one officer comes to the town for this purpose only once a week. In Herzlia "which you might even call a posh place" juvenile delinquency incidence rose by 100 per cent in the past year "twice as much in '62 as '61." An important reason for the occurrence of juvenile delinquency among newcomers is the fact that uprooting has taken away moral and social values but no new values have as yet taken their place. Interestingly the Natanya police chief found practically no incidence of delinquency among youth from religious families. It is normal in Moslem countries for the father to be the undisputed head and ruler of the family. He brings in the money and decides how to use it but as a newcomer to Israel this father is

frequently unemployed or does not earn enough to pay for the necessities of life. Under these circumstances his teenage son may become the partial if not the sole provider for the family; as a result the traditional paternal authority breaks down and an exaggerated self-estimation emerges in the youngster since he brings in the bacon. This is interesting, this was written by an Israel. (Laughter) Since he brings in the bacon, the son will not let anyone tell him what to do. The son feels mature and wise enough to do as he pleases. This often finds expression in irresponsible acts in defiance of community rules.

Problem number 4. I just use one word, the sick, but it covers a lot. Blindness is on the increase in terms of the immigrants coming in.

A very interesting thing has occurred. For the first time during 1963 we began to see a large rise in the increase of these diseases particularly among the people coming from North Africa and you may say "Well, why is this something new?" The reason is that now reaching down into the bottom of the barrel, allegorically, because we are almost to the bottom of the immigration list in Morocco, I will come to that in a moment, another year, another year and a half and it is finished, people

emerging out of some of the far distant hill villages and edge of the desert villages, who were never brought under the medical curing conditions of the JDC of the last four or five years and whom we never noticed because they were hidden away have now emerged, are now the candidates for immigration and are now bringing with them diseases which we thought had been wiped out, because after ten years of hard work the JDC medical teams had succeeded in wiping out the three terrible t's. Tinia, Trauma and TB. At least we thought they had. Now we find that isn't the case and we find that these high, high percentages are showing up again. There are places in Israel, I won't bother to take you through them, I went to one myself so I know from personal experience what I am saying, where there are scores of men, heads of families who are blind. In one place in which I went that has a total population of about 6,000 people there were 180 heads of families in that village blind. 180 heads of families might mean 1,000 people, 1,000 out of 6,000 people in that village, one-sixth of all the people in the village living in conditions in which the chief breadwinner is blind.

Let me not go on in any greater detail in that, it will all be filled out in these documents that we will

send you. The fifth and the last point on this absorption crisis is what I call the under-employed. It is a very cumbersome word. I am using that in order not to use the word "unemployed"; in order not to get into an argument with the Minister of Finance in Israel or the Minister of Trade and Industry who says "There is no unemployment in Israel." All right, if he says there is no unemployment he's the official minister of the government, so there is no unemployment. Therefore, what I would like to describe I will simply call under-employment.

On the official lists this man whom I will describe is employed. This man has no skill, he has no vocation, he's put to work on something which is called a Dachak Avodath. It means manage work. So, he's working. He's given a minimum of 15 days per month. Regulations have been changed in a very interesting way. He used to get a minimum of 17 days a month at 7 pounds a day. Now he gets a minimum of 15 days a month at 8 pound 30 a day, when you multiply it it's exactly the same total. 120 pounds a month, that's \$40. That's what he's expected to live on whether he has one child or four children. It is an eight-hour day, 15 days a month minimum up to 24 days a month maximum at

just under \$3 a day, minimum of \$40 a month and he's employed and on the government lists he's employed and you can't claim that he's unemployed and you can't ask for help for him on the basis that he's unemployed, but that man is hungry.

Let me make something very clear. I want to state it as clearly as I know how. Way back at the beginning the UJA used to run advertisements in the papers and used to make appeals on the basis of food for hungry Jewish children in camps in Europe. Buy shoes for poor Jewish children who are running naked in the streets. It was true. Those appeals were true, the money was collected for that, the money was used for that and clothing was put on the backs of neighborhood Jews. For many, many, many years the United Jewish Appeal has not advertised that way, you have not made speeches that way, we have not projected that kind of an image, although there are still some people in the world who say "Oh, that UJA these people in Israel why are they talking about hungry Jewish children, what a disservice it is still to talk that way." Well, we don't talk that way. We haven't talked that way, not for 10 years we haven't talked that way, maybe more. But ladies and gentlemen, when somebody is hungry it is

only truth and mercy to state that fact and there are people in Israel who on \$40 a month for a whole family are hungry and the Minister of Welfare in Israel doesn't deny it and you are not exaggerating if you say it.

We are not going to go into the New York Times with a picture of a person living in Natanya or Dimona and say he's hungry, but in Kfar Yerucham where I stopped on the bus with all of our mission people we were coming back where we were visiting Mr. Ben Gurion and I walked in the streets and there were some mixed families, Rumanians, Tunisians and there was a usual kind of excitement going on when the bus stops and the visitors come off and everybody runs to tell the stories and a woman was telling me that her husband on Dachak Avodath was earning 120 pounds and she made a kind of a wry pun that he would never live to be 120 years if he could only earn 120 pounds and that's a kind of epigramatic way of putting it and that it took six weeks after the end of the earning period for him to get the money, in other words when you work during the month of August for 15 of those 30 days you get paid October the 15th, six weeks later after August 30th. Well, that's all right, that's an administrative problem.

They don't have any IBM machines to crank out the checks. I said to her "How do you eat in the meantime" she said "The man in the grocery store gives me credit". I went to the grocery store with her. The grocer is the kind of grocer that nobody sees here any more. Tiny little hole in the wall, one burlap bag full of dried beans, one burlap bag full of dried nut, you know the old European kind of grocery store and he said yes he knew the woman and yes he gave her credit because he knew that her husband was on Dachak Avodath and I said, how much credit do you give her? And he says "120 pounds worth because that's what he'll earn." I said "And what happens if she has spent the 120 pounds worth buying the food from you and the month isn't up?" And he says "Then I have to stop the credit. What do you think I am, Rothschild?" And he's right, he has his problem. And so toward the last few days of that month you eat bread and tea and margarine if you can buy it, or not and they are hungry.

There are tens of thousands of heads of families in Israel living on that scale so that you may be perfectly clear what they do is mostly Jewish National Fund a forestration project, rock picking, secondary road building, culvert laying, everything that were used

to call here in the United States WPA in the old days, leaf raking. Well, in Israel it's much more worthwhile, it's building something, but that's the work that's given and that's all that can be paid for because that's all the money there is to pay and if there were more money available then you could pay \$5 more a month and \$7 more a month and \$8 more a month and that might carry the family to the end of the month instead of only two-thirds through the month.

I say that before you talk about a single, solitary new immigrant coming into Israel, everything that I have said up to now, and this more than 35 minutes worth has to be said about the immigrant who came in yesterday and the day before and the day before. This whole tremendous absorption crises of the hundreds of thousands who came in of the class of 1963 and the class of '62 and the class of '59 and the class of '57 must be explained to our contributors because they don't know. I am convinced that they don't know it. They don't know it for two reasons.

Number 1, we have never told it to them in these details and, number 2, I'm not sure they want to believe it because they have heard and they have seen a different version of Israel and this we have to fight and again I

don't want to be misunderstood in what I mean by fight. They have a version of Israel which is based upon the fact -- this is the average Jew -- which is based upon the fact that he's convinced that there is tremendous prosperity going on there that, as a matter of fact, if he reads a little bit, there is even land speculation going on there and people are making great fortunes. If he reads a little bit more and he reads the economic section of the New York Times at the beginning of January, which is put out once a year where the descriptions are given of every country in the world, he reads that the chairman of the Bank of Israel, when asked to describe what is Israel's number 1 problem, says that her number 1 problem is a surplus of currency. It happens to be true from his point of view, he's worried about too much currency in circulation, it causes inflation. He's worried about too much foreign currency, foreign currency, pounds, German marks, Swiss francs, French francs, English sterling, all high now, even the French franc which comes into the country through exports, through German reparations, personal payments which are banked in foreign currency, local currency is taken out against it, standard of living begins to rise, people are buying more things, buying advertisements in the Israel press about refrigerators, flats

that cost 70 and 80 thousand and 90,000 pounds, automobiles, television: is next. The average American Jew, good Jew, who goes and makes the trip to Israel, and there are 50,000 such every year, it keeps increasing, he has this image cracked by what he sees with his own two eyes. Boy he comes back and he tells the stories, oh, what hotels. "Did you see the Elal skyscraper in the middle of Tel Aviv. Do you know that there is not only going to be a 12-story building, there is a 32-story building going up and the mutual funds in Israel are grabbing to buy hundreds of the shares in it and everybody is in a frenzy of trying to make money and did you hear what so and so got as a concession from such and such on buying those 32 acres" then the scandal breaks in the newspaper. "Did you hear who got those special deals in Ashdod" then the scandal breaks in the newspaper. The American visitor going over there, good fellow, never goes to see where the families are blind. He doesn't get off the beaten track to see the scores of villages where our people are living. So, the reason that he doesn't know this story is, number 1, we haven't told it to him, number 2, I'm not sure he wants to believe it.

This is a tricky one and I want to make it

crystal clear again. I don't want to destroy the image of prosperous Israel, God, no. We have all worked too hard to create that image of prosperous Israel and not just an image but a really prosperous Israel. We have put too much of our guts, our blood and our treasury into this thing for a decade and a half. We have all helped build that prosperous Israel. So we don't want to run it down. We want to put it in balance. We want to put it in proportion. You can have the most prosperous nation in the world, the one in which you and I live. A richer civilization than which human ingenuity has never devised, not at the height of Rome. You can have this affluent society riddled with pockets of poverty and misery and insecurity and inadequacy. When you talk about this Babylon of New York, the richest city that the human race has ever put together you are talking about a place in which millions of people are living in misery and in poverty and inadequacy. There is no inconsistency between the two. There will be 200 13 stories at the south of Manhattan and there will be people living being bitten by rats in the north of Manhattan.

Now we have a strong, powerful, prosperous growing Israel in which there are people who are

hungry and not well taken care of and not well housed and there is no contradiction to describe it just that way.

It is a long time to make a simple point, that we made a policy decision in 1964 we would come out and tell this story. We called this story the crises of absorption, absorbing, absorbing, that sexless word, that word that doesn't get anybody excited about anything. If you can find a better one, please do. The crises of absorbing the people who have come in the last half dozen years.

After having sufficiently
impressed upon the listener
the need for a speedy and
effective solution to the
problem of unabsorbed, you
may wish to take up one
of the most important aspects
of 1964 VJA story —
immigration



after having impressed upon
28

Now, when you burn that into the mind of the listener and you make it positively clear that ~~the problem is unsolved~~ *the problem is unsolved* this can happen inside of a prosperous Israel, you then go on to the next part which is to tell him about the immigrants who are coming in 1964, and you drop the simple, quiet bombshell that just as the curve of immigration has been on the rise for the last three years, it is going even higher in 1964. As though you haven't given him, the listener, enough reasons why he should give more money in 1964, you are now about to deliver the penultimate coup de grace, because you still have one more yet to go.

On the basis of facts available to us, we firmly believe that
In terms of the immigration that is rising in 1964, we are making an estimate on the basis of 70,000 persons. Therefore, you have get a right of *to use* to say to *your audience* him that you want more money from him in '64 because there is going to be more rescue.

Two countries, one in North Africa, the other in
Rumania and Morocco will be the two main sources of *migrants* although the ratio is now shifting. In 1963 it was much more Morocco than Rumania. In 1964 it will be much more Rumania than Morocco.

Rumania we estimate to have, as of the beginning of the year, a Jewish population of 130,000. I am shading an average between estimates. 130 is

probably safe. Morocco, at the beginning of the year we used as an estimated figure 90 to 95,000. Rumania goes on now at a rate of something like 2,000 to 2,500 per month. Morocco goes on at a rate of something like 1,000 to 1500 per month. If you take 4,000, 2500 for Rumania and 1500 for Morocco, 4,000 as an average which may fluctuate a few hundred one way or the other, but that is the nut, 4,000 per month from the two nucleus countries, you then can go on to add up to 1,000 to 1500 a month more or use an average of 1,000 a month more, from every place else, a couple of hundred from Iran, 100 from Tunis and 150 or 200 from Turkey and 35 from Libya and 50 from Europe and before you know it you are there, a couple hundred from Latin America.

I ~~Let me~~ simply mention that the countries Jewish population of those two countries is somewhat estimated at 3.30-3.35. sec. Although Jews probably they are not coming from great numbers they are coming from a certain number to their point of emigration.

speaking of the retention of Jewish migration to Israel, we should note Latin America. In 1963, immigrants from that continent represented some 10% of the total migration to Israel. Ten years ago some 90% from Latin America

Latin America was quite insignificant
 In 1963 from Latin America, that is mostly Argentina, there were 7,000, so you average that out over 12 months and what do you get, you get 600, 700. Now, Latin America will probably produce the same number during 1964, maybe less if there is a feeling that things have quieted down in Argentina, if the Tacuara and Guardia Nacional are now going to be less inflammatory than they were, they have both been banned maybe; it just will feel less insecure,

gar-3

maybe there will be less movement. I don't know if it will vary by very much.

When you talk about \$2,000 a month from the two courses and you talk about the miscellaneous, you are talking about 5,000 a month, this takes you to somewhere 50 to 70,000, we are going on the 70,000, we may be wrong, but we have been really short in our estimates of the last two years. We estimated 60,000 in 1962 and 1963 and we were above 60,000 for both those years. So we may be only 60,000 in 1964, but we are estimating 70.

I will not go into the details of the migration, the Morocco to Marseilles, the camp there, you know that. Or the Rumania out, Vienna, Naples, and all that. There are only a couple of new things that I think I would like to tell you. You have to use these two facts with discretion.

We are spending now on Rumania, \$1 million a month, where a year ago we were spending a quarter of a million dollars a month. The reason is because we were getting fewer people then and it was costing less then per capita.

By the way, if anybody wants to ask you what is another reason why you ought to give more money

There is another important aspect of current immigration, namely, the cost of transportation. In 1957 and 1958, average some \$200 per immigrant. In 1963, the Jewish Agency spent \$250 per every immigrant who came to Israel. In 1964, the cost will rise to \$300. In these words, with the same sum of money the Agency spent on the transportation cost for 1,000 immigrants in 1964, it could transport 1,300 immigrants at the price level of 1957.

I feel, I must make clear, that it is not the sea part of the transportation that became costlier, but the expenses en route; the air - and overland travel from ports of departure to the port of embarkation for Italy, the incidental expenses, the minute nuance of migrants prior to the boarding of a ship.

gar-4

in 1964, it isn't only because there will be more immigrants, but each one per capita costs more to get out because of the unusual administrative expenses that we constantly find ourselves faced with when somebody throws a curve at us. You know exactly what I am talking about.

The second thing I would like you to say and I would like you to know, and you say it if you feel it is discreet to say it, the Rumanians have now started to fly their own aircraft right from Bucharest to Naples, so that some of the movement is overpassing Vienna and it costs more for a ticket from Bucharest to Naples. The airline is the National Rumanian Airline, Tarom, so, you know who gets the money. Not everybody is overpassing Vienna.

These two facts I give you, the cost per month and the routing and I don't expect you to use those with indiscretion, I expect you to observe the same discreet rules as you have in past years. Do not say these things when there are newspaper people around.

I would like to
~~I think with that, let me leave this~~
issue of
whole question of the present migration and the 1964

prospects. The people are still coming under the same circumstances, one box of bandages, 80 kilos, that is all, they are still coming under the same circumstances, one box of bandages, 80 kilos, that is all, they are still coming impoverished, ^{Immigrants} they are still coming frightened and they are still coming in the same emotional state that you and I have come to understand so well. The scenes are repeated in ^{1964 of arrival} 1964 ^{are similar to those of} as they were repeated in 1954 and 1948. The new man who arrives for the first time is not so sophisticated. ^{as the average tourist} He has not seen this happy Israel. For him ^{never saw} it is the first time, ^{perhaps} to kiss the ground. It may be ^{veteran (and he may)} old hat for the police officer who watches him. ^{Perhaps} It ^{it is the slas on the} might be old hat for the Jewish agency reception man ^{and} who takes him across the landing strip into the little shed and starts processing him, ^{where they} ^{the newcomer} but for the ^{to} watch the immigrant seeing Israel ^{or} one who gets off the plane, it is the first time, and ^{noticing} it is the first soil that is free, and it is the first ^{step on the} gush of emotion that comes out, ^{is a great human} and it never fails ^{experience, believe me.} to touch even the old hands.

The next point: security.

I think you must make positively clear what was so dramatically described just two weeks ago in the press, even in far away cities from New

York.

I have done a lot of traveling in the last thirty days and I have been over a good part of this country. Most of the time things are never in any other paper in America except the New York Times, unless there is some major item involving Israel. You never see that in a paper in Philadelphia or Chicago or Los Angeles or Boston or anywhere else, but the meeting in Cairo that took place two weeks ago yesterday was reported in every paper in the country, and the Jews all over this country knew that a climactic meeting had occurred and they knew that a danger point had been approached, lived through and passed by, but I think they also know that a time bomb has been left ticking and I think it is obligatory on all of us to take this problem, delineate it, measure it very clearly, evaluate it for our listeners, draw the implications out of it so that during the months ahead after you have left them, they will be able to understand what they are reading in the papers.

You have got to tell them about the water project, not that you are expected to become Tahal engineers, but you are expected to understand it and if you don't, then I would suggest that we get that

out in the question and answer period later.

You are expected to know what the Arabs were trying to do when they opposed it, you have to know that they had been threatening war and that Syria called for it, and the conference voted it down, or I think technically it didn't come to a vote, Nassar didn't let it come to a vote; that instead, what they did was to appoint a unified command, which they have done before, to try to destroy Israel and said that they would divert the water of the Isbani and the others, the Baniyas on their side, before ever letting the water get into Israel, and that is the way they would throttle and choke Israel.

This was a moment which was coming up to the possibility of armed conflict again. You heard me say the last year and the year before. We passed through that crisis. Israel deterred aggression successfully by her military policy of 1963 and 1962, which was a policy of heavy purchases designed to create a posture of strength for her so that potential aggressors would think twice.

It is a classic example of deterrence working on a short range basis. Deterrence has been the policy

of the United States Government for 15 years in the cold war with only minor deterrant periods in between.

On a long range 15-year program where you can build up mammoth overkill capacity you can deter, on a short range, in 1962, 1963, Israel embarked on a purchasing policy involving incredible expenditures for her which did deter even before some of the very weapons that had been purchased were installed and operational.

This is the remarkable thing about it. The Israeli man learning how to handle the Hawk missile or down in Fort Bliss in Texas. The missiles won't be operational until August, September, this is no secret, this has been reported in the Israel Press, the Arabs know it and, yet, the knowledge, the fact that these and therefore presumably other weapons which may have been unknown in terms of quality and quantity to the Arabs, succeeded in achieving this passing the crisis point.

Israel has no mysterious weapons that the enemy is unaware of.

I dare say that the number of her Mirage 3-C fighter planes are known to Egyptian intelligence, but the fact that she spent the money for them during 1963 and acquired them and has them operational resulted

in a decision of no try. Tens of millions of dollars were spent. For the first time, to the best of my knowledge, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance in going to the Knesset with open figures for the next year's budget stated that they wanted to increase the defense budget by 18 per cent more.

This was reported in the New York Times. First time I have ever seen anything like that in 15 years.

All this is a policy designed to indicate to the enemy that there will be no relaxation whatsoever in terms of acculating military strength.

With this strength you hope to deter.

The relevance to all of this to us is quite simply that in direct proportion with the amount that Israel spends on her military position, she is able to contribute less to the problem of immigrant transportation and welcome and absorption and housing and everything else that goes with it.

Therefore in 1964, looking at it quite realistically, Israel will be spending more, she has said so publicly and therefore can be expected to contribute less to the immigrant absorption program and that being the case, that is another reason why we must make

up more and more of the gap of what we have been failing to provide and what the Government of Israel has been providing and what she can no longer provide in such measure.

There is one other point, and I ~~won't~~ ^{will not} go into details now, except to make it, that part of our whole story of the presentation is the story of the JDC, of what is going on in 30 other countries. The whole Algerian situation in France, the holding operation in Poland, the continuous expenditures in Morocco even though the population is diminishing by immigration.

It is costing as much to handle a fifth of the people, I may be wrong about a fifth, maybe it is a fourth, the whole tremendous operation in Iran, 80,000 people, the increasing operation called for in the JDC budget, relief in transit, which is the Behind the Iron Curtain Operation. Eight million dollars is budgeted for that in 1964, if that much money is available.

It is a constant increase. You have to see the letters that come from countries, Riga, Kovna, Kiev, tens and tens of thousands of letters.

I read a dozen last week-end written to an address in London, from which a page is sent. The person doesn't know who the man is in London. Written

in Yiddish, written in Russian, written in poor English, "Teur Friend: I thank you, I bless you for the cloth you send me. Can you send me a luac (sic). I bless you for the tafilan you send me. Can you send me cloth."

Religion and the need of the soul and the need of the body all mixed up together.

If you can take ten of these letters and show them to people in any city in the United States and have the man willing to listen to you, you could make him understand that we are still talking about days such as we had twenty years ago when part of our people were cut off behind wire, and we were yearning to get to them and bring it to us, and when people say "Those were the days of high drama. Where are those days?"

Those days of high drama are with us now. 31,000 people have their names on a list and have written these letters and those letters are in a room in an office in Geneva. I haven't looked at 31,000 of them, I have looked at 10, at 20, at 50.

When Moe Leavitt comes next week, the 4th of February, and he spends the evening, ask him about that. There is nothing more dramatic that they are doing.

I am not going to go into it any more this

evening than just to allude to it and remind you to get the full details from him.

I think if you put this story together that I have spent over an hour talking about now: Talk about the cries of absorption of those who come in before, you talk about the present migration, you talk about the defense and security problems, you talk about the JDC problems in other parts of the world. You can go on, if you want, and talk about the prognosis. I think it is relevant.

Let me sum it all up by saying a very simple ^{making} thing. ^{statement} The prognosis of the years ahead lies in ^{status} this ^{from a single} fact, that the total reservoir of Jews in ~~all of the~~ satellite countries, that is barring Russia and all of the Moslem countries, and those are the two areas of danger, Communist bloc and the Moslem bloc, the total ^{living in tension areas contains} reservoir of Jews left alive in those two blocs is some-^{individuals} thing around four to five hundred thousand human beings, ~~men, women, and children,~~ that is all.

If every ~~single~~ ^{every one of them would live} one of them could be rescued, or wanted to leave, and 100 per cent will not, all that we are talking about is another four hundred or five hundred thousand people, that is ~~all~~.

When you realize that in the 15 years of the

independence of the State of Israel we have transmigrated, we in the UJA have transmigrated, resettled, saved the lives of by bringing them to countries of freedom, one and a half million. We have moved one and a half million, a million two to Israel, three hundred thousand to other countries of the world, Canada, United States, so we have only got a third left possibly.

If we take 100 per cent potential that doesn't seem like a staggering job. That is a very finite, that is an almost immediate. We will almost be out of work in five years. We will be the victims of our own success. Allevie (Laughter.)

Technological unemployment. Broida calls it technological unemployment. We could go afied and you could say what about the 100,000 in South Africa. Yes, they are in trouble. You can say what would happen if something bad breaks out in Argentina. Yes, there are 450,000 Jews there. You can say that episodes can happen anywhere on the face of the earth, and of course you can say what about Russia?

We all say, Russia will come, Russia will open, when that occurs we will handle that in our stride. That is the total prognosis and so what we are doing is attempting to match the upward curve of need, the upward curve of migration with an upward trend in the campaign

to try to raise more and more, but not forever because there is a finite dimension to this problem and that is a note of hope.

For sober men and mature men to understand that we are not waving some impossible goal in front of them that will saddle them for two lifetimes. There has been 15 or 20 years of hard work so what if there have to be 10 or 15 more? This is not forever.

I think that it is important because all too often people get very mundane about this, they get very routine about it. They say "Well, what the devil. Don't get me all stirred up. Don't come telling me that this is any different than any other year. You don't even have to get me to come to the meeting. You can count on me. I will give you my \$1,000 as long as I live. I will never have to go to a meeting."

How many of you have run across that type?
All of us in the room, ad nauseam.

Our problem is to make him understand that on the one hand he is right, 1964 is absolutely no different from 1954, believe me it isn't, and 1964 is no different from 1947, believe me it isn't. It isn't.

The only difference is that in 1964 we know exactly what it is we are going to have to spend and we

are asking you to give us more money than you gave us in 1963 because you didn't give us enough to match the expenditures of 1964.

We are worried, you see, about 1974 and 1964 at the same time. We want him to be a good, loyal, solid contributor in 1974, but we are not campaigning for 1974, we are campaigning for 1964, and instead of his dollars for 1964, we need 1500 for 1964. We want him for the long range, we need him for the short range, we are talking tomorrow as well as the day after tomorrow.

We have got to sort of shake him out of his willingness to give us his loyalty for the rest of his life. All too often he pro-rates that loyalty at the lowest common denominator per year and figures the only way we will catch him is if he lives long enough.

Then if he lives, God forbid 10 or 20 years too long, then he is overpaid, he should never have paid \$1,000 a year, he should have started with \$800. That is the kind of mentality which we have to break. We have to break the dues paying mentality of the good Jew who pays his dues every year to this cause and doesn't want to come to hear the story.

Well, most of us can't do anything to get him to come to hear the story. That has to be worked

gab-16

up by the field man or the organizer or whoever, but by golly once he comes then I beg you to give him the story and not the old stories that all of us experienced 20 years ago in our lives, please, but this story which I have tried to delineate here tonight.

When I said that we have a right to ask for more money, some time astronomical figures don't make sense. I would like to finish by giving you, I think for the first time, figures out of Mr. Tabatchnik's extract, which are quite real and which many of you have often asked for and never have been able to tell you right down to the last penny.

Now we can.

Many of you have said "What does it cost to take a person out and bring him? What does it cost to do this, this, this?"

I would like to give you a few figures and maybe you can use them effectively in 1964 as we make our rounds.

Transportation -- and I am only going to use that word, but I want you to understand that it includes many more things than the price of a ticket on a plane or boat. It includes many more things than the price of the transit camp, than the price of the

food enroute, than the price of the escort officer to accompany the boat enroute.

It is a generic phrase "transportation." There are some powerful costs hidden inside that. Per capita, averaging out whether the man comes from distant hill village in Morocco or near a town in Roumania, per capita transportation, point of egress to point of arrival in Israel, \$302. Every time a family of five people steps off a plane you look at it and you see \$1,1510 bucks; initial absorption, (a) first meal in Israel at the arrival point. This is all per capita, 25 cents; (b) transportation by bus from point of arrival to village or town in which settled, \$3.10; food parcel containing bread, rice, beans, oil, sardines, tea, sugar, salt, pepper, marmalade, candles, matches and a can opener, and if you can think of anything else, tell them, they would like to know, \$2.20 per person; household equipment and furniture, bed, mattress, blanket, table, chairs, wardrobe, ice box, \$45.75; cash grants from the moment of arrival up to the first few months, and it is a loose thing until the guy can catch on to a job or can get onto the Dachak, the manager roll, averages out \$9.65 per person; health insurance including hospitalization for all immigrants for three months,

the first three months in the country and hardship cases get a year, \$6.25 per person; grants to municipalities in the development towns for services that they have to give to the immigrant until he gets on his feet, \$3.25 per person; total \$70.35 for the whole bloody business you are talking about \$70. Two evenings of dinner and the theatre, that is it.

So it is \$302 to get him there, and it is \$70.35 to give him cigarette money in his pocket and boxes of food and a mattress to sleep on and three months of hospital insurance.

Then his house averages \$1435 per person, \$1435. An average dwelling is around \$5,000 for around 500 square feet, 450 square feet. They are building a little better now, a little more menchedik. If you add the \$302 to get him there and the \$70 to take care of him in the first days, and the \$135 to put the roof over his head, what have you got? \$1800, it looks like. That is it.

If anybody says to you "what does it cost to save a human being and take him out and take him over and bring him and put a roof over his head?" It is \$1800, proven and documented point by point. You take that fact and you use it as you see fit.

Well, it has taken an inordinate length of time, but I think we have made a penetration of this thing in depth and I am at last, thank goodness, finished.
(Applause.)

If anybody has got any strength left at this point to ask questions, the floor is now open and we have got Mr. Broida and Mr. Tenzer, Mr. Bernstein, Mr. Fishzohn up here, plus about 100 of you who are capable of answering questions. So the floor is now open for any questions that anybody would like to ask of anybody, or any comments that anybody would like to make.

A VOICE: Rabbi Friedman, you suggested that if anyone has a good word to offer to match the word absorption, to suggest it to you. I would like to propose a word which was the key word of Nassar's meeting with Arab leaders, namely Arab Unity. He did very well with a quotation from the Koran. I think this is an excellent chance to use all material which you presented to say to our groups which we are addressing that we, too, must not forget our unity and that the only answer we can give to Nassar and all the other Arab leaders bent on Israel's destruction is unity, and what is better than tangible ways to manifest it than by rallying around the UJA campaign.

Secondly, I want to ask a question. We have

spoken a great deal, you have spoken, that is, about the five problems. Suppose someone asks you what specific measures does UJA take toward the solution of those five problems, especially the problem of under employment. You have given us the cost of transportation and initial absorption. Someone might ask you what are you going to do with the tens of thousands of people, what share of the UJA budget will be directed towards the solution of this problem?

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is no share of the UJA budget would go toward the problem of paying citizens of Israel. Avodath Dachak is a government employment scheme. We can not put our money into the government employment scheme, but it is very simple. If we could raise more money and if we could spend two million more dollars on housing, three million more dollars on housing, five million more dollars on housing, and take that load off the shoulders of the government they can increase the employment rates by five million dollars worth.

When they have to spend all the money on the housing that we fail to provide and that is what we are short on, we are always short on the housing item, we are never short on the transportation, we are never

short on the absorption, never.

The \$300 per capita, per person to bring them, if you have 70,000 persons, it is going to be \$21,000,000. This twenty-one millions we take the whole cost and also with the \$70 per capita of the first absorption which, if it is 70,000 people, is going to be 4.9, five million more.

Take the whole thing and then we take as much of the housing as we can take depending on what we raise and what we can not pay for in the housing the government has to pay for it. Education, Mr. Bernstein says. Yes, I didn't give you the Youth Alija figures that we contribute to, how it is per capita for the child depending on what kind of an institution he is kept in. I have it all here. When we have spent all the money we have raised, if we have raised sixty million dollars and if we have spent it, then the government of Israel has to start spending. If we can raise five million dollars more they would spend five million dollars less on the housing, then maybe they could go ahead and increase the amount of money given to the Avodath Dachak. That is how it would work.

A VOICE: I have a question about the mechanics and I would like to make an observation. It took you

35 minutes to speak about the five problems and then another half hour or more about speaking to a more knowledgeable audience than the audiences which each of us have to face. The first thing which the field man says to the speaker is "Not more than 25 minutes." Of course, I am sure that all of us appreciate the compliment that you pay us that you think we are so capable that we can teach the whole Torah, and tell the whole story which you told us tonight, plus the necessary interpretations, in those 25 minutes. The question is how do you utilize the mechanics of time?

Now a couple of observations.

THE CHAIRMAN: Excuse me for interrupting. Let me try to answer you on that very briefly. I feel that my responsibility is to teach as much of the Torah as I know, as I can get across in an hour, an hour and a quarter, as much as people can stand. Obviously you can't do that.

If I tell you everything I know, then you take out and you pick out the pieces that make sense to you and you tell it in your own way. I would take a 20 or 25 minute speech and I would break it down as follows: I would tell this crisis of past absorption for 10 minutes. So it means you have to distil what I said

gab-23

in 35, 40 minutes into 10. Take a fourth only. Take 1, 2, 3 things that are sharp, that are poignant, that are dramatic, that you can tell the way you like to. Everybody has to do it himself. I would spend five minutes on the current immigration, 1964 immigration; I would spend five minutes on the 1964 security problem. I would spend 5 minutes making a worldwide survey of the JDC. That is 25 minutes.

I would make a five-minute dramatic peroration at the end to get their emotions aroused. That is 30 minutes. If you haven't got 30, but you only have 20, then scale the whole thing down. I don't know if that answers you, but that is how I do it.

A VOICE: For a minute I thought, I personally don't accept this limitation of 25 minutes, I never did, it never bothered me.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't either where I can get away with more.

A VOICE: Actually this question was an introduction to the observation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

A VOICE: I for one welcome this story you told us as an indication that for a change the United Jewish Appeal realizes that the public of the contri-

butors have to be made partners and that they shouldn't be approached only on the basis of emotional appeal for a given moment to get the maximum today and not to leave behind any education on the problems because you spoke tonight of the water of the Jordan, of the whole Mid-Eastern situation, of the problems of security, of war and peace.

I mean the whole Torah and this is actual, in my judgment, the most effective way of building up, because you spoke too of the necessity for next 15 years, 20 years we will have to come again and again to those people.

We will have to educate them. Education can't be made by UJA speaking, unless he has himself the knowledge of the problems and if he has the time to tell the story.

You spoke of security. I think there is another element in the picture which can be very effective and I think it should be included by all the UJA speakers and that is the boycott, the Arab boycott which should be presented as a threat to the Jew in America, to the Jews all over the world, not only to Israel.

I think this is a very powerful weapon which

is being absolutely neglected because of shortsightedness on the part of the Zionist and Jewish leadership and I think it could make a very effective part of that Torah which you want us to tell.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, sir.

A VOICE: I would like to make just one observation. In the few minutes that you gave as a mechanical report for the 25 minutes of how to present the problem you left out, in my opinion, one very important aspect and I know because it is my job here in America to sell the aspect of the good in Israel, the wonderful conditions and the hotels and the whole positive aspect of the country.

It is no illusion of normalcy, the country is good, the country has its development. Even when we speak of development they take the people there and they show the people what has been created in five years and everybody gets very excited. In my observation, I think that the threat has got to be put clearly that while the country has progressed and is progressing related to the problems which you have presented tonight because the papers, the tourists and the goings and the comings have presented Israel as a model, as a development as aid to the underdeveloped countries, we'

are seeding out people, and yet on the other side we are asking, taking and wanting from the people here.

So, I feel that it is fundamental to make this point absolutely clear and bring home to the people the question of development and of the positive, together with all of these things that you have presented this evening.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I thought I covered it. I don't know whether I gave the proportionate amount of time to it. I said that it has its negative and its positive aspects. The great, really tremendous achievements in Israel have sometimes tended to blind people to the fact that there are still problems. If, on the other hand, you concentrate only on the problems, then obviously you are shortchanging the progress and it is this bald picture of progress, yet problems, that we have to have the skill to portray. The bald picture is what has to be portrayed quite, quite correct.

A VOICE: Could you delineate a little bit on how we might handle the water situation of focusing attention on the development in the Negev?

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't have a map here so I just have to assume that everybody is quite familiar with the geography and knows what we are talking about. Way

gab-27

up in the north there is one stream which rises on Israel soil, that is the Dan. There are three others, never mind the names, that rise on Lebanese, Syrian and Jordanian soil. Normally, they flow into the Jordan and the stream goes southward into the Lake of Galilee, and from there southward into the Dead Sea.

A key in this whole business is the plan of a man by the name of Eric Johnson, who was sent over there many years ago by President Eisenhower to try to work out a development scheme using the water for the benefit of both parties, Israel and the Arab countries and, to cut it all short, the essence of it was he suggested dividing up the water 40 per cent for Israel and 60 per cent for the Arabs.

There was a technical committee of both Arabs and Israelis which agreed with this on the technical level. On the political level the Arab States said no, because this would have meant in effect that they were recognizing the existence of Israel.

So, the plan broke down and the Johnson plan remained then just something on paper.

Israel started her own development scheme on her side and at first started to build a system whereby she would take water out of the Jordan River north of the

lake, but Syria objected and the United Nations stopped her and Israel quit that and started to build a scheme which would take water out of the Lake of Galilee, which is completely on her territory.

Jordan also started a scheme to take water out of one of the rivers, the Yarmuk, and financed by American money, to build an irrigation scheme on her side.

The whole point of the Israel scheme is to take water from the north and bring it down south of Bersheba, because the development towns in the south, from Ashdod south are the towns that are going to be predominantly the places filled with immigrants for the future and I don't have to make any speech to indicate that without water there is no future.

The constituent elements of the scheme are one pumping station at the Lake of Galilee, burying underground, hopefully quite secure from attack, to pump the water uphill through a series of open ditches triangular in shape, 16 miles worth, to a reservoir at a place called Salmond, where there is almost a million cubic feet reservoir and a second pumping station there also buried underground to pump it again up over the hills and then to have it fall down all the rest of the way by gravity to the Roshian pumping station outside

of Tel Aviv and from there join the main line south and go all the way.

Aside from the 16 miles of open ditch, all the rest of it is buried underground, pipes 9 feet in diameter, 9 feet in diameter, 108 inches, big enough for a tall man to stand in and still have room. Every piece of which was built inside Israel, mostly by new immigrants, mostly at that plant down near Ashkelon called Ya-aqot, at which all of it was built and it is all done now and now the workers have been laid off and now there is one great big stew going on there with fights with the Histadruth about recession, and all of that, and retrenchment and separation pay, and everything.

They built for 10 years pipe, I don't know, 150, 200 miles of it. The essence of it simply is to take the water from the lake up in the north and bring it down south, the implication is in terms of absorbing future immigrants are quite clear, future immigrants are not going to be absorbable beyond a certain number without this water.

MR. HIRSCHMAN: I just want to say a few words about this Eric Johnson plan because I happened to get over on the other side of the Jordan for the

for the United Nations and saw the budding of the part of the Johnson plan in Jordan and Syria. I think it is very important to know that the Arabs having gone through with their part of the Eric Johnson plan and have succeeded and have practically finished their section of it which was originally recommended by Johnson, and which the Arabs, principally Nassar, had vetoed politically, technically having finished their part of the job or in the process of finishing it, they now refuse to permit Israel to go through with its part of the job.

I think from a political point of view it is very important for that to be noted.

THE CHAIRMAN: They have refused to let Israel go through with her part of the job. They have tried. I don't know whether you all saw the New York Times editorial summing up this thing when the meeting was all over. When it was all over and it was noted that they had backed down, that they had chosen not to start a war at this point, nevertheless the Times said -- and I have got the words right here, talking about Arabs and Israel "The two sides are nevertheless set on a collision course." In other words, there is an inevitability of collision about this thing unless the Arabs back

down and accept the fact that Israel exists and Israel is going to draw this 40 per cent of the water and the United States Government has said it will be okay if it does, unless they accept, which they have not yet done, the fact that there has been a temporary pause in this thing doesn't mean that the problem is solved.

The two parties are set on a collision course. I myself wanted to make this comment because I was afraid, listening to my own words, that I may have given you the feeling that everything is all over, because they didn't start hostilities out of this conference that from now on we needn't worry. I wondered if I gave you that tone feeling or not.

If I did I want to take it back. Every one of us has breathed a sigh of relief that we have gotten past this particular moment, but this is no guarantee whatsoever that the problem is over. As a matter of fact, it isn't. It hasn't been solved at all.

The next crisis comes, whether it is in March or in May when the test running is all over and the whole operation is put in, when the cork is pulled for good, because right now what is going on is a series of testing in partial links of it. You test valves, you

test to see fittings, if there is any leakage, you test 20 miles of it. You don't fill it up with full pressure. A series of testings are going on now. When those are done and the running in process is completed, as this is called, and the whole thing is let go, as I say, nobody knows when that is going to be, there will be another moment of crisis at that point, and there will be threats and the air will heat up, there will be more meetings and more headlines and we will see what happens then.

We are set on a collision course unless they choose to back down, because Israel has made it perfectly clear that she intends to run that water.

A VOICE: Is it physically possible for them to stop the running of this water in going ahead with their own plans to dam it up on their own soil? Is it physically possible for them to stop on their own soil?

THE CHAIRMAN: Sure it is physically possible. They can cut into the extent that what will be left from the one head water which is on Israel soil is 23 per cent of the present total. In other words, they can cut three-quarters of the way into this thing. You say is it technically possible? The answer has to be yes. But then go on, how long would it take them

to do it, how much would it cost them to do it, who would help them to do it, all these are technical questions. I must say yes, sure they could cut it.

A VOICE: They can cut three-quarters of the whole Israel scheme?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right, on their soil.

A VOICE: Cut it down to just one-quarter?

THE CHAIRMAN: They can cut the source of supply down to one-quarter. But will they, will they find the technicians to help them do it, will they have the money to do it, how long will it take them to do it, are they going to do it? We don't know.

MR. BROIDO: I just wanted to say on that, certainly this is going -- this is nothing we can all go into in an education program, but just as a matter of interest I think the real point of danger in what you are talking about is exactly the same thing as when there was some talk that the Sudan would bring Nassar to his knees by cutting off waters of the White Nile before it ever got to Egypt, you see.

They couldn't do that because when the Sudan was government, under the Dominion, the whole agreement which ran on as to the disposition of the waters of the White Nile continued so nobody ever cut it off. The

great danger point here is, and it touches on what Ira said, and that is that if they did or could or tried to cut off the waters before it ever got to Israel, we would have to do something about it.

We would be faced with some aggressive action which would create an enormous problem of world importance for us. This is the guts of the matter, it seems to me, only to be talked about here because we are interested in the subject. It is nothing you can use to raise money with. That is the real nature of the problem is the one that they are talking about.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you are right.

Are there any other questions? There are just two matters that I would like to bring to your attention that I didn't do before. For those people who work in the New York City campaign: You know that there are several other elements which enter in your telling of the story in the New York City campaign. There is the high as part of the story, there is the Jewish Welfare Board, part of the story, and Natanya. But Natanya is part of Nationa, too. Those of you in the New York City campaign are thoroughly conversant or should be and have the material to substantiate the description of those included agencies. I myself have accepted an invitation from the JWV to speak at

their annual dinner in April for UJA, their annual fund raising dinner for the campaign.

The other thing that I would like to mention is that there are three campaign films for 1964. One of them is a women's division film which was narrated by New National Chairman of the Women's Division, Mrs. Jack Karp, of Los Angeles, together with Lawrence Harvey. That is about 15 minutes, and it was shown the other day at a big regional conference in Houston, and received a very good reception.

Secondly, there is a very good film, most unusual and I have seen them all, made half of them, when I say it is unusual, it really is, shot in a small village way down in the Bled in Morocco, things I have never seen on film before. We have never been able to get them on film before only because of the new technique of lighter cameras and transistorized equipment that you can carry easily, and don't need complicated lights and things and this is called, I think "Ten Days and 500 Years," and it shows how people are transported 500 years in time in the course of ten days, and it shows how they lived in this village in Morocco and how they live in Israel.

There is an interesting technique to it.

The parts that show Israel are in color, the parts that show Morocco are in black and white. So inside of one, 15-minute documentary, you have got color and black and white and psychologically the contrast is quite good.

The third film maybe I shouldn't describe, the fellow who made it, shot it and all, maybe Hy Brown, if you would just take a second and tell us about that third film, I think we would like to hear it. Hy Brown, the well-known producer.

MR. BROWN: A Jew. I didn't make the film as a well-known producer. I made the film because I think we had something to say which I don't think any other film I have ever made had to say. The equipment that Herb speaks of we took with us. The entire picture is in sound. In a half hour film we have three and a half minutes of narration. The entire picture talks for itself.

It was made in Paris, Vienna, and Israel, and tells the story of children. This is the story of one in every two that is rescued, or saved, or rehabilitated, is a child or a young person. That may be a startling figure. Emotionally and dramatically it is a tremendous weapon to tell the UJA story.

We move from Paris where we have the North

African children, to Vienna where we have the Roumanian children, to Israel where we have all the children, the well, the happy and the sick.

We spend a day at the Centers with the deaf and the repatriated and the paraplegics, and the disturbed children. Then we spent a wonderful day at the Youth Aliya and at the other schools, and we see the children come in and become absorbed, and move into the whole picture of Israel.

I have seen the thing now maybe 60 or 70 times in the process of simmering three hours worth of story to 27 minutes. We have Robert Preston for the three and a half minutes of narration. The picture also has something, we speak in Yiddish, in French, in Hebrew and in English. It is a 4-language picture, and we don't bother very much with translations because I think what we say is very easily understood and emotionally followed very quickly.

So that again the picture has all kinds of facets and I know that the television stations in the communities throughout the country will welcome this very, very strongly because it is dramatically as sound and as absorbing and gripping as anything which they have shown, the Defenders, Dr. Kildare, the problems

within the picture are the things that they can identify with and relate to.

Hopefully I think we have something very exciting.

MR. BROIDO: What is it called?

MR. BROWN: Memo to Parents. These are your Children, you gave birth to them 15 years ago, 12 years ago. You brought them into the world and you take care of them now because they are yours, they belong to you.

MR. BROIDO: What kind of a camera was it?

MR. BROWN: We used a new camera. The only time it was used this was the prototype.

MR. BROIDO: What nationality?

MR. BROWN: French.

MR. BROIDO: How can one camera speak four languages? (Laughter.)

MR. BROWN: This is called Spieltzak with the UJA. (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: When are you going to have it ready?

MR. BROWN: Two weeks. Tomorrow Mr. Robert Preston does the three and a half minutes before his matinee, Thursday at 4:00 o'clock we mix and hopefully by a week from Friday we should have the first answer

print.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can an answer print be shown? We have got two meetings, one on the 4th and one on the 11th. We will miss the one on the 4th; at the Gottlieb-Hammer meeting on the 11th can it be shown?

MR. BROWN: Possibly.

THE CHAIRMAN: What we want to do at the Hammer meeting -- leave the meeting on the 4th, we will show that Moroccan film and maybe the women's film, and on the 11th if Hy Brown has it ready at the Gottlieb-Hammer meeting, we will show that children's film.

Did I see a question in the back or are we ready to adjourn?

MR. BROIDO: Before you adjourn, I think you said a very interesting thing about the dues paying mentality. Henry knows there was a family in New York where there were three brothers and they gave \$30,000 every year, one year they only gave 20. So he asked the top brother what about the third brother's money. He said he don't want to belong any more. (Laughter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, we thank you for your patience and we hope that you think the meeting was worthwhile. (Applause.)

(Time noted 10:15 P.M.)

We must not forget for a
^{single} moment the simple ^{and} obvious
truth, namely: problems not
solved today do not wither
away. The unsolved problems
linger on, they stay with us
as a tragic and bitter reminder
of the protracted process of absorption.

To illustrate my point, I would
like to refer very briefly, to
the problem of the ill-housed
one.



Insert 2.

There is, on my list of
absorption problems (may I
add parenthetically, that
the list is not complete) one
last item, - relief work, ^{or} Avoda
leachav, for the unskilled
immigrants.



Insert 3.

Some of these individuals never expected to "see" the money, some were waiting for the day the money comes.

Both the pessimists and the optimists lived modestly, after denying themselves the simple amenities of life



I will try to give you as complete a picture as I can of major problems we face this year, and those are fundamental issues we stress in our fund-raising speeches.

Firstly, I would like to deal with immigration, which is always our primary concern. The 1964 combined figure for Israel and other countries reached 66,000. I am glad to report to you, that in 1964, we have assisted the largest number of migrants from one of these countries in 13 years.

The main source of last year's migration were the, so to speak, traditional two countries; one in Europe, the other one in Africa. There is every reason to believe that in 1965, the conditions will not change, and we may confidently expect a similar ~~to~~, or perhaps a larger number of migrants from these than in 1964. As we see it, the size of current migration will be determined not by political conditions, but ~~rather~~ will be determined by technical and financial factors: availability of transportation and funds.

I would like to cite one example of the close interplay of finances and immigration to Israel. In January, 1965, the construction of housing in Israel was falling behind the schedule. The Jewish Agency had to decide either to bring people ~~in~~ and put them into unfinished homes or keep the immigrants in transit points in Europe. Because of the housing shortage, immigrants stay in embarkation ~~cities~~ ^{centers} between four and five weeks instead of the four or five days, as it was the practice until recently. However regrettable and unfortunate, the decision has been made, that there has to be a delay in transporting of immigrants in order to give Israel a chance to catch up with the construction of houses. Admittedly, it is a very bad situation, because several hundred persons were forced to postpone their journey for four or five weeks. The unexpected and unwelcomed idleness is demoralizing, besides being expensive as well.

Now, let us go back to the main points of immigration.

The figure we are permitted to use in open publicity is the one that you have seen in the first two UJA advertisements, namely, 250,000 for the last four years, 1961-1964. That is the extent of relaxation of the ban imposed by our Israeli friends on immigration data. We are still not free to publish data on countries of immigrants' origin, nor are we free to release monthly figures. These two items we must treat as restricted information. But, I repeat, the ban is substantially lifted, because now we may say that a quarter of a million immigrants came to Israel in the past four years. Then, by ways of simple arithmetic one concludes that immigration to Israel averaged sixty thousand a year, which is what it has been. And, this is for 1965, perhaps, slightly higher.

Moreover, the transportation costs keep going up. Let me give you two figures, two, may I add, telling figures on the rising transportation cost: in 1963, the average cost per immigrant was \$259; in 1965, it rose to \$309. Now you can see that there will be more expense attached, either to the same and certainly to a larger number of immigrants.

Since I must move fast, I shall omit the analysis of political conditions in countries of migrants' origin, and I will not describe the mood of our people inside these countries.

The second problem facing us is that of absorption of large numbers of immigrants. There are some interesting figures and facts which have been developed recently, which could be used advantageously in presenting UJA story.

Of the quarter of a million persons who came to Israel during these past four years, ninety-two per cent were destitute. "Destitute" in the literal meaning of this word: 9 out of 10 immigrants had one suitcase each of possessions they brought with them to Israel, and that was all. Forty per cent of the families who came during this period ranged in size from five to sixteen persons. It means, that entire family units, representing three generations - grandparents, parents and children - moved to Israel. These outsized families, with one or two breadwinners of a low earning capacity, were responsible for the impressive increase in Israel's load of welfare cases.

There were times, during the four-year period, that thirty-four per cent of the newcomers were welfare cases; including blind, sick, TB, handicapped, aged -- all the variety of human misery we conveniently call welfare cases.

The monthly grants in Israel run as low as fifteen dollars for a person and as high as fifty dollars for a family of 6. In 1965, 28,000 cases of newcomers will require immediate aid at a cost of 7 million dollars. But a considerably larger sum, - to be precise, \$12,200,000 must be spent on social welfare among immigrants by the Agency and the Government of previous years.

Now, I would like to bring to light another important factor hidden in the statistical heap. Among the quarter of a million immigrants who came to Israel during 1961-1964, 100,000 ~~of~~ ~~them~~ were children under the age of sixteen. In terms of Israel's future, these children are a blessing; they will help to build and to develop the country. But, today, these children present a problem, a harsh problem of finding funds for schooling, clothing, housing and feeding. We must not forget for a single moment the simple and obvious truth, namely: problems not solved today do not wither away. The unsolved problems linger on, they stay with us as a tragic and bitter reminder of the protracted process of absorption. To illustrate my point, I would like to refer very briefly to the problem of the ill-housed.

Some 13,000 immigrants are still living in the ma'abarot. These are the hardest of the hard-core cases, who have not been moved out to better, normal dwellings, in time; and now it is perhaps too late to move them to regular apartments. Many of these immigrants are resigned to their lot of perpetual welfare cases.

Two, - there is in Israel another group of immigrants numbering about 30,000 families - which comprise between 120,000 and

150,000 individuals who are ill-housed. Each family lives in a one-room flat, built on the standard of twenty-eight square metres, which is 280 square feet. Four or five persons living in a room of less than three hundred square. These thirty thousand families have been one-room-housed for a long time; a great number of them came to Israel immediately after the country achieved statehood.

There is, on my list of ^{6 years} absorption problems (may I add paranthetically, that the list is not complete), one last item, - relief work, or Avoda Dachak, for the unskilled immigrants. About ten thousand men, heads of families, work on the emergency relief projects, which provide a family with an average income of forty to forty-five dollars a month.

As you see, one cannot talk about ^{immigrants} who came to Israel in the last four years, without mentioning a host of other absorption problems that beset the Jewish Agency.

^{three} Item No. 3 on my agenda is the economic situation. It will be your decision whether to use or not ~~to use~~ this topic in your speeches, but I would just like to deal with it briefly and give you some of the major facts.

The economic issue is confusing, and it is difficult to figure out how best to deal with the schizophrenic phenomenon of the apparent prosperity of Israel and the dire need of the unabsorbed, - the welfare cases, the ill-housed, the poorly equipped immigrant farmers. But the image of a prosperous Israel is much stronger, more prevailing than the not-too-apparent problem of the unabsorbed. Some of our listeners wonder why they should contribute continually, when Israel is doing so well.

There are certain facts, and perhaps through them we can evolve an answer to this question.

It is true that the gross national product rises, on the average of ten per cent per annum, and has risen so impressively for the past eight or nine years. This represents an incredible, phenomenal rate of growth, second only to Japan.

The second accomplishment is that the average family income continues to rise, so that, now, it is approaching quite a respectable figure of something like twelve hundred dollars, which compares very favorably with many countries in Western Europe.

All of this would seem to be on the positive side.

On the negative side is the fact that the gap in the balance of payments continues to widen perilously each year. In 1964, the gap in the balance of payments leaped to \$530,000,000 -- over half a billion dollars. In 1963, it was \$460,000,000; in 1962, \$400,000,000. The gap in the balance of payments has been going up year after year, for about the past five or six years.

Now, it is true that Israel's ~~export~~ export has been growing. In 1964, it came to \$500,000,000. But it is also true that Israel imports ^{well} more. In 1964, Israel's purchases abroad reached one billion-one hundred million dollars. Part of this amount represents hard currency

expenditures ~~spent~~ for armaments, and I will comment on that later. Part of this sum, however, represents money spent abroad to improve the standard of living of the population.

There are people - and I am among them, as well as the Governor of the Bank of Israel - who believe that there is a very serious economic crisis brewing in the country, and this view is based upon several ~~distinguishing factors~~ disquieting facts.

First of all, there is the great dollar gap, which carries with it a large dollar interest payment every year.

Secondly, the creeping inflation, which can reach a point that ~~will~~ ^{make} necessary another devaluation of the pound perhaps even inevitable, and should that occur, it will throw the economy back again.

Thirdly, there is coming to an end the flow of capital derived from restitution payments to individuals. I am not referring to German reparations to the State of Israel. I am talking about individual receipts, put in the hands of tens of thousands of Israel's citizens, of large sums of money - five thousand, eight thousand, ten thousand dollars. Some of these individuals never expected to "see" the money, some were waiting for the day the money comes. Both the pessimists and the optimists lived modestly, often denying themselves the simple amenities of life. When restitution payments finally come, they put part of it into savings and a part of it into consumption. And when the purchase of consumer goods rises and rises, the country runs into that classic bind of supply and demand; the country soon finds that it is overspending; the price of goods goes up, this leads to inflation and ultimately, the country is forced into a devaluation.

All of this is to say that there has been in Israel in the course of the past six years much too rapid a rise in the standard of living.

Now, to state this, as I do, or as Mr. Horowitz or anyone else does, does not mean to begrudge the individual citizen of Israel the greater comfort he now can afford. Nonetheless, from the point of view of orthodox economics, the consumption of goods and services is rising too rapidly. Somebody must ring the bell and remind the country of the danger of overspending on private consumption, which may lead to another economic crisis.