



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
13

Speakers Division. Seminar. Transcript. 19 January 1960.

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

U. J. A. SPEAKERS DIVISION SEMINAR

8:00 P. M., JANUARY 19, 1960

PARK SHERATON HOTEL, TROPICAL ROOM

Address by RABBI HERBERT A. FRIEDMAN
Executive Vice-Chairman of U. J. A.

I would like to try tonight to set out for us, for me as well as for you, what the line and the approach of the 1960 campaign could be, is, or should be, because it is a tricky one.

It may take a bit more time for us to make the exposition and to get down to the heart of the matter. And that, itself, is an indication of the difficulty, because the longer it takes to say something, the more complicated the issue is.

When something is sharp and crisp and clear, you can say it quickly and briefly and succinctly.

I would like to talk to you tonight without oratory and embellishment, without rhetoric, but rather as an explorer who is trying to find a new approach to a common problem. Therefore, I would like to feel free to say things which are perhaps not politic or are phrased diplomatically; -- things which wouldn't be published, or otherwise made known outside of this room, because the transcript of my talk tonight will go only to you. I would like to feel free to discuss with you matters which I hope you will consider seriously, and modify and weigh with your own sense of good judgment, by the time I am through with it.

Firstly, in a spirit of confession, let me say that I am taking a gamble this year -- not I, but we all collectively.

We are taking a gamble, a calculated risk in the way we change the approach to the campaign.

This fresh 1960 approach is a transitional one. If it works, we perhaps will have succeeded in making a breakthrough to a new way of campaigning for some time to come.

Let me try to make clearer what I am saying. You and I have told our campaign story year after year after year on the basis of what we consider to be the best, the most practical and most valuable form of getting the contributor to respond immediately, with the most dollars. And the old way, the traditional approach, was to sound the alarm as hard as we could vis-a-vis the current events with which everyone was most familiar from every source of communication, eve, from the source of the public press, so that the listener, having an apperceptive mass of knowledge about the subject we were bringing to him, would then be more predisposed to respond to our appeal.

If the headlines told the story, it made our telling of the story that much easier.

And we exploited the current events and the headlines, day by day, for all that we could.

My voice was perhaps the shrillest, or perhaps as shrill as anyone's, and I was, therefore, as much involved in this way of campaigning as anyone. We took an immediate event, and we would say, this is what we need the money for, and then we would hope that the headline would continue so that we could repeat it tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow.

The most classic example of the old approach that I can think of is the campaign of 1953; the doctor's plot started in the Soviet Union, and a group of Jewish physicians was indicted. We began to run that campaign on the basis of the fact that we probably had to save all the Jews of Russia who otherwise would be slaughtered. When the doctors' plot exploded and the item

was out of the headlines, that campaign fell apart.

We always run the danger, when we campaign on the headlines, of having somebody pull the rug out from under us.

It wasn't just in 1953. It happened last year, in 1959, with the Rumanian situation.

On March 9, immigration to Israel stopped. On March 10, very few of us dared to say there was no more Rumanian emigration. We didn't dare to say it, because in direct ratio to the manner in which we had been banking on the headlines, we had a direct amount of signs indicating that the campaign would collapse under us.

I am not saying that over the years this policy was wrong -- God knows. All I am saying, that that is the way we did it.

As mentioned before, this year is a transitional year in which we hope not to do it on the old basis. If we succeed in raising as much or more money with a change of approach -- then we will have succeeded in making the transition from the immediate-topical-headline-type of campaign to a different kind of campaign approach. We will not be afraid to use the long-range, the historic approach. Instead of the task of a year, we will discuss the task of a generation.

When I say "afraid", what do I have in mind? All of us as good campaigners are faced with this paradox, that when we want to talk in long historic terms about the task of a generation, we are afraid that if we are talking to a man about ten or twenty more years of giving, he will do the arithmetic in his head and he will say, "If I must give for twenty years, then I better prorate my contribution and cut it down in every single year; because if I am expected to give a la longue, or if I am expected to continue this indefinitely, then I better not blow my top or do anything extravagant at

any given moment: I better pace myself, temper myself, and not let my emotions run away with me — and if they are telling me I have the task of a generation ahead of me, I better be prepared to give a little money each year to stretch it out, instead of giving one limit now all at once."

All of us are afraid to talk about the campaign of 1970, because we think that we might lose dollars immediately, in 1960.

It is a normal fear.

Because that fear weighs so heavily upon us, we have always tended to talk about the immediate, this year's campaign — and nothing else.

The gamble that I referred to is simply this:

We shall try to evolve a campaign approach which will take advantage of the immediate events of any given year or month or season as those events occur, but it must transcend the immediate events (which we will exploit and take advantage of). Adequately presented eternal themes may enable us to go on for another half decade and another whole decade. It seems to me, that the year to take that gamble is 1960.

If we succeed with it, this year, we will breathe easier, and we will go into 1961 or 1962 or 1963 with less fear. We will do the long-term approach better after we have had a year's experience behind us and see that it did not cause a catastrophic loss.

This is the frank confession. There are those who press me all the time. At five o'clock this afternoon I was told "don't gamble with it."

I think we are in this together; I think we have got to, I think we will, and I would like, therefore, to project that kind of campaign approach which I call the task of a generation.

In order to talk about it effectively, I think, you must remind the listener, as I must remind myself all the time, of the turbulent decade

through which we have come.

You have to talk about war. Israel was born in war. Recently Israel went through a second campaign.

In my judgment Israel has not seen the final one yet, and, therefore, war and sacrifice, battle and blood and glory are all part of what we have been through.

Money was raised on it in 1948, because that stirred people, and again in 1957, because that stirred people too.

In addition to war, we have had expulsion. Everybody knows the story of Iraq in 1951, and of Egypt in 1956 - 1957.

We have had flight. People still remember the story of the Hungarian tragedy, and vividly recall the picture of escapees fleeing the border.

We have had regulated immigration movements. Everybody recalls the Operation Magic Carpet of Yemen.

We have had mass migration. Everybody knows the first push of 70 or 100 thousand out of North Africa.

We have had all of the dramatic, the stirring, the exciting, the unexpected, the historic.

We have had it.

We have had a surfeit of it in the last decade.

War and famine -- who doesn't remember what Israel was like in 1950 or 1951, when all you got was fish -- frozen fillet from Scandinavia, or native-grown carp from the Galilee, which had heads and tails and no body, because they didn't leave them in ponds long enough to grow bigger.

We have had war, and we have had famine, and we have had expulsion, and we have had flight, and we have had border crossings, and we have had mass movements. We have had all the things of which great novels are made.

This is a moment in which we have none of that, not an item of those adrenalin-secreting words -- not an item looms on the present horizon.

When you begin with this kind of preamble, and remind people of all the things through which they have gone, this preamble need take no longer than a minute or two. You find the audience in a receptive mood ready to accept your statement that now, after a stormy decade, we must step back a pace and take a measured look during the wonderful breathing spell we now so happily enjoy.

And to step back and take that measured look enables us to evaluate exactly what we have done in the past decade.

"Decade" I use always generically -- the exact time is 11 and a half years, if we measure from the beginning of the State of Israel.

The breathing spell enables us to step back and evaluate what we have done. This is the opportunity that you have almost at the beginning of the speech, about the long-range historic issues, because in evaluating tasks completed and aims that lie ahead you begin your talk with this statement:

There have migrated and been resettled 1,300,000 Jews. Almost a million to Israel, and 300,000 to other countries in the world, in these 11 years.

There have migrated and been resettled one million three hundred thousand. This enables me to step even farther back, and take a longer look, not just at the last 11 and a half years, but to take a look at what I call a century of migration. For the twentieth century is certainly that. If we could find no other word to characterize it, (because we wouldn't know whether to call it the century of the destruction under Hitler, or the century of creation under Israel -- not knowing how to choose between those two titles), we could always go back and call it the century of migration,

because I think it tells the whole and bitter story. Of course, we must not forget for a single moment that the century of migration resulted in the very large, very creative and fruitful Jewish settlement in the United States.

The century began with migration when your fathers and mine came from eastern and central Europe to those shores. What was the migration of Jews from Russia, Poland, the Pale, in the year 1900? I don't know for sure, but my guess would be that in 1900, some 150,000 Jews came into the United States -- maybe more. I speak about Jews only -- in just that year.

I know perfectly well that between 1882 when the restrictive May laws were passed in Russia, and 1914, when the World War started and traffic across the Atlantic was cut down, in that period of 33 years, 3 million Jews migrated to these United States.

Roughly speaking, the twentieth century began with this fantastic migration westward. The middle of the twentieth century saw the decimation of Jewish communities and the fantastic migration eastward. And by the end of the twentieth century, if one were to be bold enough to predict, the entire demography of the Jewish world would be changed. Migration would be finished. There would be two large polarized centers of Jews; one in America and one in Israel, - and practically nothing else in between -- a few communities, whom I don't intend to deprecate and write off -- 400,000 Jews in England, or 400,000 Jews in France, or a million Jews in South America. But none-the-less they will be peripheral to the two poles of America and Israel.

So that in the longest perspective and with the deepest kind of historic understanding, this is a century of migration.

It began that way, and it will end when the migrations are finished, and I believe that is the way it will go down in history. The Jewish world will

be changed at the end of the century from what it was at the beginning! It will be changed in a manner that the change will endure for a thousand years --- just as previous great, enormous shifts took place and lasted for half a millenium or a whole millenium.

In the framework of this great century of migration, the last 11 and a half years that we are talking about saw a movement of a million 300 thousand people, the million to Israel, the 300,000 to the other countries.

What has been the fate of these people?

In what circumstances have they found themselves?

I don't think that we have to concern ourselves with the 300,000 who went to Canada, Australia, South America, United States. Those three hundred thousand of Jews have merged with and integrated into established settlements. In economic terms, they have been absorbed quite quickly into the milieu because the Montreals and the Torontos, the Buenos Aires and the Sydneys, the Detroits and Bostons existed in those other countries to which they went; there was the industrial fabric and there was the settled community into which they could move quickly and find housing and find jobs. The economic background was there for their absorption.

We are not disinterested in them, but we can dismiss their case rather quickly as being any kind of permanent problem once the resettlement was finished.

It is obviously the million who went to Israel who are our concern as the task of this generation.

The theme of the 1960 campaign simply stated in one sentence, must dwell upon the problems of those of the million who are not yet absorbed in Israel. The 1960 campaign is based upon the problems of the unabsorbed who comprise one-third of that million.

The figure that we use is 350,000; The manner in which they are unabsorbed will occupy our attention as we try to describe in some detail why we call them unabsorbed, and what must be done to further their absorption.

Before going into it, I believe, there is one other comment that could well be made in order to give heart and courage to those people who, if you present them with a long-range historic problem, always have a tendency to ask, "Well, how long do you mean?"

That question comes to us all the time in another form, when people say, "How long will this keep on; how much longer are we expected to give?"

If you take the fact that the resettlement and the migration of those who had to move and wanted to move amounted to 1,300,000 in the last 11 and a half years, then you look at the remaining reservoir in order to see how much farther you have to go.

I think we should be well versed in these statistics.

The reservoir of Jews who might be potential migrants to Israel, if 100 per cent of them were to leave countries where they feel insecure, physically or spiritually, would, excluding the Soviet Union, amount to a maximum of 800,000 people. That is all we are talking about.

In other words, we have put 1,300,000 behind us already. There are only 800,000 to deal with as a maximum theoretical possibility. This figure is arrived at by adding together the total Jewish populations of North Africa, Iran, (where there are 80,000, the largest number in Asia), Syria, Lebanon, if we could get them all out, and all the satellite countries: Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia.

Excluding the Soviet Union, and you notice I have excluded Western Europe (from which there are not anticipated any large migrations and certainly it is not anticipated that we should have to subsidize such

migration if it were, hopefully, to develop), we have a total maximum possibility of 800,000 people. It is probable that this theoretical maximum will never be realized. But anyhow if we have already "handled" 1,300,000, even if there were to be another 800,000 this would represent no horrendous and impossible burden.

As a matter of fact, these figures indicate that we are almost two-thirds of the way done.

This is the answer to the people who ask the question, "How long and how much more?"

Let us go back to this question of the exact and specific needs or, as we call it in a cumbersome and awkward language, the unmet needs, -- a phrase I wish nobody had ever invented; it is not grammar and it is not English, it doesn't say anything, and it always has to be horribly explained -- it is too complicated.

If anybody can think of a better one, please do.

The problems of those who are not fully absorbed in Israel and who still need something, is what we mean by "unmet needs."

I usually try to outline four categories which we lump under this heading of needs which must be met.

Firstly, there is the question of the ma'abaroth. And this you all know very well. The current figure is 60,000. Hopefully, it will drop and drop and drop as the years go on. It is quite lower now than it was a year ago.

You all know perfectly well how to exploit the theme and play on the theme of the shock and disillusionment of people who are brought into a ma'abara, which in Hebrew means a transit camp, and they, the immigrant, know perfectly well that it means transit. And they find that their transit is protracted beyond comprehension; that they remain for months and years, -

and many, many years.

They are shocked and they are upset, and they are a little bit hurt. Cries of discrimination arise, and people say, "Why are we still in the ma'abara? Because we are Sephardim, Moroccans, Iraqis, or something other than the fine Ashkenazim of Poland or Russia or Rumania or Hungary?"

You can rationalize all you want, and you can reason with them all you want. You can tell them that it is so on the basis of first in, first in, first out -- they don't believe it.

You can tell them all the time that it is a question of not being able to put Polish immigrants into ma'abaroth because they wouldn't stay there and they would write back letters to Poland and some more Polish Jews wouldn't come -- so "please, you nice Iraqis, who have been sitting here six years, please let us take the Poles of six weeks ago and put them in fresh houses; you stay here and wait some more" -- try to tell that to them. You can't, really, you can't -- it doesn't hold water, aside from the fact that it is not being decent.

Nevertheless, it has been done.

You know perfectly well how to take this whole theme of what it means to live in a ma'abara, and exploit the human values in that story, with all the skill that trained speakers can do.

We tried to do it in the film, "The Key," which has been received with such mixed emotion; some people think it is horrible and some people think it's fine.

What we tried to do in that film was to show what life is like inside one of those little tin prisons. We tried to show how the family disintegrates, as father and mother fight and squabble over the years; children run away from that; sons are delighted to go off to the Army

and not come back; daughters run to the nearest big city, and little children, little boys are scared and grow up from the age of 9 or 10 (in the middle of this maelstrom) -- and if psychiatry ever became fashionable and popular in Israel, we would be producing candidates for future couches at the rate of 10,000 a year.

We take the Ma'abara issue and describe how a family trying to live inside that "thing" for a number of years falls apart as a family.

What is the moral of the story?

In spite of our best intentions, we are succeeding in destroying that which we consider to be one of the greatest and finest virtues of Jewishness, which we boast about -- our wonderful family life.

Is it not clear that people living in ma'abaroah are not going to produce a wonderful family solidarity, because of the corrosive effect of this kind of life over too many years?

It is a story that is full of human drama; and it is a story that every mother and every father understand.

If there are still 60,000 people living in places like that, then Dr. Joseph had the right to use the word, as he did at the December conference, to describe this -- it is a shame; a shame means a blot on the escutcheon of our honor and our dignity.

That has to be wiped out. There isn't any question about it.

Slums are number two on the list of unmet needs. I put the slums next to the ma'abaroah, because this is also a question of housing.

I don't want to exaggerate this. I simply want to indicate it.

You all know the story of what happened last year at this place in Haifa called Wadi Salib. It is a slum. Most of its inhabitants were graduates of the ma'abaroah. They had gotten out of the ma'abaroah, they were living

in these slums. What is a slum? It is a kind of rabbit hatch, narrow alleyways, small rooms in irregular fashion down steps or up on the second floor, unknown numbers of people living in these places, no water; no sanitation; and electricity possibly the only amenity.

And inside these teeming swarming areas, which are not large — but which are large enough to contain thousands of people, you find the breeding grounds for new enterprises in Israel that until recently were unfamiliar to the Jewish spirit and the Jewish tradition.

There might have been — Jewish prostitutes in the little towns — I don't know, maybe there was one; she had a monopoly.

The whole concept of finding gangsters, pimps, tough boys, confidence men, gangs of juvenile delinquents is foreign and new to us.

We just don't associate this manner of life with Israel.

I know, there is a school of thought that says, let us become normal and let us be like everybody else, and let us have our share of criminals and let us have our share of gangsters; and isn't that wonderful. — No, it isn't.

To me, being normal is not that you can have your share of criminals and your share of epileptics and your share of Teddy boys.

These Wadi Salib incidents are unfamiliar to the Jewish tradition, and the idea of breeding Wadi Salibs in Israel is slightly revolting to me — and I think to everybody.

The fact that these places can be eliminated is something that we can bring very carefully to the attention of our listeners, because here again it is largely a question of resettlement from slums into better housing.

But having torn them down, these people have to be put somewhere else; and when we talk about housing, we have to talk about housing for ma'abara dwellers, and I think also for Wadi Salib dwellers. They are also under-privi-

leged.

The third thing that I tried to dig at in this question of the backlog of needs for the unabsorbed is the matter of the farm settlements.

Again a couple of figures are in order. The Jewish Agency established in the 11 and a half years since the State, 485 farm settlements. They are all over the country. On these settlements they have placed 32,000 farm families for a total of 130,000 men, women and children. That is one big chunk of the total immigrant population.

Again, let us be perfectly truthful about this. Do you think all those 32,000 families wanted to go down to those farms? Of course not.

Many of us in this room have sat at the shed in Haifa or at Lydda, or at other processing points. I will never forget sitting up at Shaar Aliya and watching this processing of immigrants go on, where the man from the Jewish Agency absorption department, is sitting behind the desk and the immigrant comes to the front desk, and the man says, "You are going to go to the Negev." And the immigrant says, "What? I want Tel-Aviv." And the man says, "You want Tel-Aviv? -- The Negev." And the immigrant says, "Don't tell me where to go; I am just as good as you are; this is my country just as much as yours." And the fellow behind the desk throws his hands up. And you have that marvelous colloquy between the two of them, in which one Jew is trying to persuade another Jew to do something. And I don't have to tell you how hard that is.

When the discussion is finished, the immigrant is put on a truck with the meager baggage and he goes to the Negev.

He goes down there and he doesn't like it -- sometimes. And sometimes he runs away.

This chap two months later or six months later moves himself to Tel-Aviv on his own.

However, you and I know, also perfectly well, that thousands and thousands stay there. And slowly, surely, acclimatize themselves and get used to it, and slowly, surely, do a good job.

Let us be honest with ourselves. We boast about this vision, the new Jew, not the luftmensch in the ghetto, not the fellow trading on the street in the black market; the fine Jew with the plow in one hand the gun in the other hand, and he is out there fighting the desert, and the sun is making him brown; and we say, "good, look at that new Jew."

We have a right to take a satisfaction in that new prototype, -- the one who stayed in the Negev.

In direct ratio to the joy and satisfaction of seeing this new man emerge, there should be the sense of obligation to support him in this unknown difficulty, - this fearsome new life upon which he has embarked.

You know perfectly well that none of us, you or I, would like to be dumped in the Negev -- especially without any skills.

And if the immigrant has done it, and if he has yielded an image of the kind of Jew we like, then the quid pro quo is very clear. The least we can do is not stint on him, not hold him back, not throttle him by an inadequate flow of capitalization into his farm, so that he can make the thing become self-sufficient and pay off.

I don't want to startle anybody. But, of the 485 farm settlements that have been started some 11 and a half years ago, do you know how many of them are self-sufficient in the sense that they pay off? That the 200 farm families who live on them earn their living from the produce of that farm? Not one.

Shocking, eh?

Is it because those Jews don't know how to farm? No.

Is it because they don't want to farm? No

Is it because there are no instructors to teach them? No.

The economics are very simple. Not a single one of those farm settlements has been fully capitalized. That is all.

Again you might say, what kind of a way is that to do business, start 485 of them and not finish one? It is not logical.

You might say:

Start 60 and finish all 60.

But you and I know: it was considered "illogical" to take in a million people. You started 485 of these settlements and you dumped 130,000 people on them in an effort to begin the process of absorption. Don't forget, all those 130,000 people at least have houses. That much they have.

They are on the way -- to self-sufficiency, but in a long, long way. All we can say, they have started. They are not finished -- not a single one.

According to the best estimates based on figures I received, between 60 and 100 of these settlements -- are on the verge of what is called self-support. That is, earning their own way. To achieve it, they need elements of capitalization which in some case might be a mere paltry few hundred thousand pounds to put in the livestock, or in some place, where water is lacking, there might be more than that; In some place it might be less than that if all that it is lacking is some machinery.

Here is the third issue of what we call "the unmet needs." And you could bring anywhere from 60 to 100 of these villages up to snuff very quickly if you had full capitalization for them.

This brings me to the fourth and last point that I describe in this process of absorption.

If the families are on the farms and if they are in those houses, but if they can't earn their living from those farms, what do the men do? This is the problem that I call the problem of underemployment, not unemployment.

— let us make it very clear.

As a matter of fact, in Israel today there is a shortage of skilled labor. There is no unemployment in Israel today by anybody's criterion.

There is this situation which I call chronic underemployment in which these men, many of them working on the farms, cannot secure their livelihood from the settlement itself. They are taken off in a system of subsidized jobs, what we used to call the W.P.A. They are given employment, necessary work: — rock crushing, culvert building, bridge building, tree planting, — all good things for the future of Israel, but all designed, obviously, to give them a certain amount of cash money to buy food.

The standards vary from 12 to 15 days a month, sometimes more, but that is about the average.

Fifteen days of work a month at 5 pounds a day amounts to 75 pounds — 40 dollars.

So if that is what the husband is earning, then it is obvious that the wife goes out and tries to work, and even the children go out and try to work; and the chance for a child to get into secondary education is slim. Because at the age of 14 to 15 he must go out and try to help the family make some money.

Now, look — if you take this package and put it together, ma'abaroth and housing; family disintegration and slum conditions; undercapitalized farm settlements and underemployed farmers, you get a sharp picture of the daily life of the one-third of all the immigrants who have come into Israel in the last 11½ years and who are not fully absorbed.

That is the campaign theme with as much emotion or drama as you can inject into it, with as much of an understanding as you can possibly give people, that to dump somebody on the beach at Haifa is simply not enough.

All of this is without any reference to another important fact, which is the fact of new immigration to Israel. Here we are on tricky and treacherous ground. I would like to be perfectly free and frank, open and honest with you.

And yet without attempting to be arbitrary at all, I would like to suggest very humbly that the story of the absorption be the main story of the campaign theme, and that you not get involved in the question of new immigration, except to make the obvious statement (that after you pour your heart out on this whole presentation, you then say),: "I have been talking to you about the old ones who have been in Israel, six, five, four, three years. And what about the new ones who are coming tomorrow and next week and next month?"

Remind them of the new ones who are coming. But I would like us this year to stay away from the whole story of new migration. May I tell you why?

I do not want us to go out this year and say there will be 20,000 Jews coming to Israel or there will be 50,000 or there will be 10 -- for two reasons. Because we do not want to be faced at the end of the year with any statements that we made false predictions.

The second thing we do not want to be faced with is the raising of the nose in the air -- "Oh, you are only talking about 25,000 Jews; what is that?"

Well, it is \$25 million for that one item alone; it is a third of what we raise: moreover, it is more than half of what we give the Jewish Agency.

But the contributor dismisses it. And he does, because we have gotten him used to figures of 100,000 and 150,000 and one million.

We say to him 25,000, and he says nothing.

We should refer to the fact that there is obviously a steady flow of new immigrants coming in, that the clock did not stop, and we ask the audience simply to comprehend what it means to try to solve the problem of the backlog, when there are new people also coming all the time. There is no need to specify how many and from what country.

Having said all this about Israel and the immigrants, old and new, I have still said nothing about the Joint Distribution Committee. I think there again it is a question of the story of the Joint Distribution Committee, and not the institutionalized Joint Distribution Committee.

The work of the JDC, in human terms, has been lost in the shuffle year after year, because of the obviously more exciting, stimulating and demanding events that held and captured our attention; and so, just as we never had time to talk about the farm settlements, so we never had time to talk about the children in Morocco who go to the schools and nurseries to get a hot lunch every day, - (30,000 of them!) just as undramatically as you put a handkerchief in your pocket every morning. You don't think about it, you put a handkerchief in, you need a clean handkerchief.

How many people in this room think even once a month of the fact that 30,000 kids get fed every single day in Morocco?

What is this worth in human terms? Talk about telling a campaign story. Talk about telling a story in which you try to get people to understand what Jewish values are. What is the difference? 30,000 youngsters in the Ghetto at Casablanca, or 30,000 kids in Tel Aviv — they are 30,000 Jewish children.

I would recommend seriously and honestly that you take hold of the UJA budget book, this dull printed budget book and again, reading on page 27, where the story of the JDC is knocked down, paragraph by paragraph, in this

unglamorous way that a budget tells the most glamorous things in the world.

\$29 million is the budget of the JDC for this year. Some of it they receive from the Claims Conference; German money, -- six, seven, eight million -- I am not sure how much exactly. A little tiny bit; I don't know, another million, maybe less, from South America -- around \$20 million from we UJA.

Don't you think that for giving away \$20 million of money we raise for a certain project we ought to talk about it? I repeat, not because the project or the organization that runs it is holy in any way at all, but the work they do is work that we want them to do, and the people from whom we solicit the money would like to know about. Where do they spend it?

Well, we are right back to old home base again. Of the \$29 million in their budget they are going to spend \$11,000,000 right in Israel on the Malben program. Right back in the same Israel that commands all our love and all our loyalty and to which we want to see the money go.

And if the Malben weren't spending that \$11 million for the people in -- 6,580 beds, then somebody else would have to spend that money. It would be the Government, it would be the taxpayers of Israel, it would be the immigrants of three years ago who would pay for the immigrants of two years ago, that is, because somebody must support the sick and the aged and the handicapped, and so on.

By the way, 6,580 beds which the Malben has in Israel is more, I think, (unless I am mistaken) than the number of beds the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies has in New York City. I may be wrong. It is a powerful thing, isn't it?

Look at the next item -- \$5 million in Moslem lands.

Well, those are the 30,000 youngsters in Morocco, and those are the 20,000 children in Iran, and those are the sanitation teams that burn down the hovels of the Mahalay in Isfahan or Shiraz. And those are the parasitologists who go around giving the kids emetics and laxatives to take the worms out of them in all the terrible places in Persia; and those are, and those are, and those are —

You have \$5 million worth of relief, succor, comfort-loving care that you are "dishing" out to Jews in Moslem countries. If we think that Jews in Kansas city or Duluth or Dallas are not interested in hearing about it, we are wrong.

Western Europe and Poland, \$5,300,000.

I was in Poland in December. I made my second trip. I visited it two years ago, just after the JDC was invited back there.

Fantastic, the way that thing works. A little under \$1 million is spent in Poland. Think only, out of this \$5 million, which JDC budget calls "Western Europe and Poland" — \$1 million in Poland.

This money is going out in the form of 200 zlotys and 500 zlotys, mere pennies.

Going out in the form of cash relief or food, medicine.

Going out in the form of relief to cooperatives so that Jews can get together and work.

30,000 Jews in Poland, it is all that is left out of a population of more than 3 million — and it is getting smaller and smaller all the time, the remnant of the remnant of the remnant since Hitler's time — talk about their conditions and talk about the spending of \$1 million a year. We could spend 2 if we had it, (and we wanted to), and we wouldn't be putting anybody in luxury.

There is an item in the JDC budget which I don't want to explain any more carefully than they explain, and it is called "Relief in Transit"; three and a quarter million dollars. You know what they say. I will just read their words.

Relief in Transit. Every other item, it says "Belgium, Holland". It tells you what country is getting it -- But tens of thousands of destitute Jews who cannot be reached through the welfare programs described above -- (the welfare programs mentioned above are described by country), nevertheless receive considerable assistance through this special relief in transit program.

This program is as important and as vitally needed as any carried on by the JDC anywhere.

I think you understand. Three and a quarter million dollars. We could drop thirty-three and a quarter million dollars into this thing, and it still wouldn't reach the bottom.

Reconstruction, \$1,800,000 -- it is mainly for that the ORT. JDC gives to ORT \$1,650,000.

Cultural and Religious Activities in Israel \$745,000, and other, \$1,900,000 -- "Other" means all the special things like the once-a-year matzoh grants, and all one-time special grants to Yeshivoth. Everything that does not refer to a permanent on-going program, but is an extraordinary item that must be dealt with once; also in the \$1,900,000, is the overhead of the New York office and Geneva headquarters.

We talk about the problems of the unabsorbed, and, as though that were not dayanu, we go on to the business of new immigration into Israel, and as though that were not dayanu, we go into the business of the JDC.

There are only a couple of slogans that I find I keep using all the time, and they keep coming up over and over and over again, and they help me

to tell the story.

If they tell the story for you in that same light, then you use them, and maybe we can translate them to others.

It is the task of our generation to rescue a people and to build a land.

We have achieved the transportation of vast numbers of immigrants to Israel, but not their transformation into productive citizens.

Man does not live by freedom alone. He sometimes needs bread.

The state has been built, but it is not yet a nation.

You wave the flag at the end, at least, I do -- to myself, because I believe this with all my heart -- You and I are working to create one Israel, not two: with a privileged class and an underprivileged class; -- one Israel with liberty and with bread for all people.