



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
9

Speakers Bureau. Meeting. 11 January 1959.

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

U. J. A. SPEAKERS DIVISION MEETING

AMERICAN JEWISH
ARCHIVES

PARK SHERATON HOTEL, TROPICAL ROOM

8:00 P. M., FEBRUARY 11, 1959.

SILLS REPORTING SERVICE, INC.

38 Park Row New York 38, N. Y.

REctor 2 -1780

U. J. A. SPEAKERS DIVISION MEETING

FEBRUARY 11, 1959 --- 8:00 P. M.

PARK SHERATON HOTEL, TROPICAL ROOM

NEW YORK, NEW YORK.

Seated on the dias were:

HON. SIMCHA PRATT

MR. AVRAHAM HARMAN

MR. ABRAHAM HYMAN

MR. ARTHUR FISHZOHN

RABBI HERBERT A. FRIEDMAN, Chairman.

U. J. A. SPEAKERS DIVISION MEETING

8:00 P. M., FEBRUARY 11, 1959

PARK SHERATON HOTEL, TROPICAL ROOM

Chairman: RABBI HERBERT A. FRIEDMAN

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Ladies and gentlemen:

I am sorry that Mr. Harman and I were late in coming and have therefore imposed upon you to this extent, but we were involved in another meeting, as usual.

It was a dinner meeting at a restaurant which my secretary described as Luigi Siegel, and when I got to Luigi Siegel's, it is Lou G. Siegel (laughter) with which you are all familiar.

Let me welcome you very warmly.

In the light of the previous meeting which we had, I feel very warm about people who want to work for the campaign and go out and talk for it and spend their time for it.

It is just heartwarming to be in your presence right now at this moment.

And especially to welcome so many of you which, to me, is an indication of the fact that you feel strongly about the subject matter of this year's campaign, and if

you feel strongly about it, then you will transmit that strength of feeling to others.

There is no question but that there is a mood of excitement and concern and therefore dramatic overtones in the present situation which evoke the best kind of response, both from you as speakers and from the people to whom you speak.

Let me begin, therefore, right at the beginning by saying that I don't think that we will have much cause to congratulate ourselves at the end of this year if we show that we have raised more money.

Contrary to previous years, where that would always be a matter for self congratulation with regard to effort expended, this year to end up saying that we have raised more money is not going to be anywhere near gratifying enough.

We will raise more money. The question is: How much more money?

To that end you must put all your efforts forth, because the Jews of the country are sensitively aware of the fact that an enormous historic event is occurring, and when they are aware of that they do respond.

Our responsibility is to get the response in a

dimension which is worthy -- worthy -- of the historic moment.

With that as a prelude, and having, therefore, put that goad into ourselves, let me go to the facts of the matter.

Don't forget always that we don't speak to you, or at you as audiences. This is a sharing, a seminar -- a very large seminar, but you have got to ask questions, and please do.

Never was the factual data more important, because it had been obscured, of necessity, by the limitations about what can be put in the press and what cannot be put in the press.

We here will speak openly and you to audiences will speak openly, with the proper precautions that there are no press people in the room that might report you.

Therefore, first we digest the body of fact, and then each one in his own eloquence and with his own rhetoric and with his own skill, puts the emotional window dressing around those facts.

And here is the story.

As most of you know, I was in Romania about a

week ago, or ten days ago. The fact of this is no secret.

I simply applied at the beginning of December for a visa and at the beginning of January received it. There was no intervention, no political pressure, there was no diplomacy involved.

If they were willing to grant it, then I was willing to go, and that is exactly how it took place.

There are a quarter of a million Jews in Romania of whom half live in Bucharest.

Bucharest is the only large city in the country. It has a population of a million and a half people.

Beyond that the country consists of three or four smaller communities where there are concentrations of Jews, but the largest after Bucharest is 17,000 or 11,000, 16,000 -- and they are widely scattered.

Cluj, Timisoara, Arad, Iasi, Transylvania, Bucovina, Bessarabia.

You know what the historical background of this population is. Today it is a quarter of a million. Before the War it was about 850,000.

Hitler worked in Romania until 1944. He was driven out about a year before the war ended by the Russian troops who came in from the east.

Nevertheless, he had time to do in about half of the population. From a pre-war of 850, it became a post-war in 1944 of about 450.

Then there were two more movements, '44-'45, and then '46-'47, where sizeable numbers of Jews, 50,000 at one time and 60,000 at another time, left the country to go to Palestine. One group went westward into the D. P. Camps in Germany and Austria.

The Jewish population of Romania was always Zionistically oriented, always had its mind on Palestine, seized quickly post-war opportunities to get there.

If you take off the group that went in '44 and '45, either directly or via the D. P. Camps in Germany and Austria, you have the thing reduced to about 350.

Then in 1949, 1950, the Romanians permitted an open emigration to Israel on their ship, the Transylvania, which went once a week from Constanza, their harbor on the Black Sea down to Haifa. It took three days to make the voyage.

She left Constanza every Thursday, she came to Haifa every Monday.

She carried 1800 to 2,000 Jews, and she went back empty three days later and returned with a new load.

During that period, '49, '50, into the beginning of '51, 100,000 Romanian Jews went to Israel.

You will hear people say, "Well, a lot of them went back to Romania. That has been a very highly exaggerated figure." Under 2,000 of that 100,000 went back to Romania, and they went back in the vain hope to get more relatives out.

It cut off quite suddenly without any warning, in spite of the fact that they had been making good money on that voyage -- it was their boat -- it cut off quite suddenly and left families split asunder with enormous emotional wrench, and I don't have to describe that for you, but you will want to describe that for the audience, of what it means for a mother or a father to have gone in 1950 and to have waited and expected that a week later or a month later on a successive ship, some one, the children would come, or the old grandmother would come -- and they didn't come.

This separation, this splitting asunder of family units gave tremendous human grief to these hundred thousand people, who kept up a relentless pressure ever since 1950 for the reopening of the doors so that they could get their families again.

That pressure had practically no results for eight years until 1958, at which point, if you keep this calculation in mind, the population is down from 350 to 250, which is its present size.

In the late summer of 1958, August, indications began to emerge that Jews could leave again, and when you have a population as you do in Bucharest of 125,000 people in one city, and many of them concentrated in a specific Jewish quarter, Jews talk to each other in the streets and they begin to talk to each other, that we can travel, we can creep out, it is possible, you can get an exit visa, risk it, apply, go to the police, register -- and there were many people who went to the police and who registered and who were arrested at the beginning, until the administrative procedures were made clear to the police all the way down the line.

Then Jews who were registering were no longer arrested. The first broke through the ice.

By September it began to be clear, and a mob psychology was going through the Jewish quarters that you could go out, get your name down on the list fast, and by October the registration rose to such a crescendo that there were days when as many as three, four, even five

thousand people in one day lined up at the police station to register their names.

I keep saying police stations, because I want you to understand something about this.

This is a process which is being run by the Ministry of the Interior. This is not just a technical difference that I am describing to you.

Normally passports and documents and travel and visas and all are given by a ministry of the exterior -- foreign -- you go to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in the United States, the State Department when you want to get a passport.

So in any country.

In Romania it is not in the hands of the Foreign Office at all. This is done by the Ministry of the Interior, and the Russian words for Ministry -- or the Romanian words for Ministry of the Interior are the initials "M.V.D.", and "M.V.D." are also the initials for State Secret Police -- in other words, they are synonymous.

Therefore, I describe this -- and maybe Abe Harman will disagree -- as a police action in the sense that the whole thing is controlled and regulated and handled ab initio, from the beginning, by the police.

The Jew therefore goes to the Ministry of Interior, the M. V. D. office and he puts his name down and registers that he wants to leave.

Let me get the figures in --I will interrupt myself and give you the whole table of costs of these documents.

You heard all about the difficulty of the documentation. You heard all about what he has to pay.

Let us get it straight and let us know exactly what we are talking about.

When he makes this application to leave, he pays 75 lei per person. The lei is the unit of currency there. A lei is worth in our money eight and a half cents, twelve to a dollar.

That doesn't describe anything. The average workingman's salary, and it is pretty well state controlled, there are no fluctuations -- you can't go and peddle your wares from one factory to another in the hopes of getting a bigger salary -- the average laboring salary is 600 lei a month.

The average salary for so-called workers in the intellectual classes, or the free professions, doctors, architects, journalists, actors, artists, lawyers,

accountants, is about double that, about 1200 lei a month.

These are, roughly speaking, with almost no variation, the two wage levels of the country. The manager of a large plant makes 1200. The worker in it makes six.

So that it isn't enough to say eight and a half cents per lei. You have got to remember income, 600 a month for most of the people.

When the Jew goes to the Ministry of the Interior to register for his emigration, he pays 75 lei per person, children under the age of fourteen, free.

He then goes home to wait. In the course of the waiting, several things happen to him and to his family. It doesn't take very long before the names go from the Ministry of the Interior to the plant where he works or the school where his child is registered.

In both places he begins to feel the first pressures which are upon him as the result of this voluntary act of his to leave. The pressures are simple.

In the school the teacher stands up and says in front of the class, "Which children here have registered for emigration to Israel?"

There are enormous scenes of pathos and tragedy where kids come home from their school where they have

been made the butt of ridicule and abuse, and complain to their parents, "What did you do?"

What does the ten-year old child or the twelve-year old child know? He doesn't understand.

He lashes out at his father and his mother for having put him in this terrible position vis-a-vis his schoolmates.

At the plant the father who is much more innured to the slings and arrows of fortune, doesn't worry what they say about him, either to his face or behind his face, because he has a bigger worry, he is out of a job.

It doesn't happen that he loses his job the first day after he registers or the fourth day after he registers, but believe me, by the fourteenth day and by the third week and by the fourth week he is off the list. He is declared redundant.

There is no other place where he can go to get work, and I want you to think of a very simple fact.

There are now in Romania approximately 100 or 110, some people say, thousands of Jews registered to leave, 110 thousand.

Thirty thousand heads of families, roughly speaking, most of whom are jobless.

Now, understand what that means in terms of anguish and suffering and human fear.

The period of waiting goes on. At some point, and I can't tell you exactly when it is because it varies, but take it roughly, three months, four months after he has registered he receives what is called his versendigung, his approbation, which is a document, again, from the M. V. D., saying that his request to leave is being granted, but he must fulfill certain conditions, and there is a list of the things he must fulfill.

The first thing he is told that he has to do is go back to the police and renounce his Romanian citizenship. This means that he is now stateless in terms we used to use, and if you want to talk about these 100 thousand Jews, they are jobless and they are stateless.

Economically and politically insecure and uprooted and completely tenuous in their relationship to this country on whose soil they still are.

The small fee that is charged for the renunciation of the citizenship is 1,000 lei per person.

By the way, for the sake of this calculation, I would like to take in a normal thing, a family of two parents and two children. So you can take everything that

I say and multiply it by four.

If the registration is 75 lei per person, that is 300.

If the renunciation of citizenship is 1,000, then it is 4,000 for the four of them.

After he has done that, he then must begin the merry-go-round of running from one government office to another government office, to clear his dossier and to show that he owes nothing, either to the state or to any other individual.

That sounds simple. Go down to the city hall, look up the record and you see whether you owe anything.

Not quite as simple as that.

The City of Bucharest is divided into eight municipal departments. It doesn't matter where he lives in the city, he must go to all eight. Seven is no good. And in each one of the eight municipal departments of the city they look up his record for the past eleven years, which is the length of life of this regime. It came into power in 1947.

For eleven years they look to see if all his taxes are paid.

And the fine for non-payment -- or for any debts

which are owed -- is 180 per cent, compounded over the years.

Torture.

When he has gone through all eight departments, he comes down through to the main central city hall, gives them the eight exhibits, all of which have little stamps on the bottom, for every one of which he has to pay 50 lei and 20 lei and 30 lei and 60 lei, and he accumulates all eight and he turns them in and he gets one back in return saying he is kosher, it is clean, he owes nothing.

This is incredibly difficult, and let me give you some stories to indicate what is involved in this process.

I saw a woman sitting with her husband, a hunch-backed man. She explained that this was her second husband.

Her first husband was a bookkeeper in a plant. In 1950 there was an act of embezzlement in the factory and 30,000 lei were stolen and two people were arrested and held accountable for this, the manager of the plant and the bookkeeper of the plant, the bookkeeper being her first husband.

They were found guilty of the embezzlement.

They were charged with paying the 30,000 lei and ten years in prison each.

After a year in prison her husband committed suicide. He couldn't stand it any more.

The years go by, she marries the second man, she had children with the second man, and now comes this great opportunity, she registers to go out, she has to clear her dossier, they find in it that her first husband had this record. So they require her to pay the 15,000 lei which they hold as a debt against him -- now against her, now against her second husband, now against the children of her second husband.

In a great act of forgiveness, they waive the 180 per cent fine, because this compounded annually would have made the 15,000 lei debt astronomical -- hundreds of thousands, obviously unmanageable.

However, in lieu of waiving that, they decide that she should also pay the 15,000 lei of the husband's partner, who didn't commit suicide, who is still in jail serving out the remainder of his ten years, but who hasn't paid his 15,000 either, so it is 30 and she has to pay 30 -- her dead husband's and the manager's.

Where does she get 30,000 lei when her husband

can earn 600?

I will tell you in a moment how that works.

Another story. A man owned a tailor shop. In 1951 they came and they nationalized the tailor shop.

Communism, nationalize.

They made an inventory of everything in the tailor shop, but he entered a caveat. He said, "Look, there are seven coats which have been brought here for me for storage, repairs, they are not mine, they are from customers."

You already can see the end of the story.

They took the seven coats. He was clever enough to get a receipt.

He told the seven customers at that time, 1951, that the coats had been taken by the government, he had no control over it.

Now, in 1958, he wants to leave, and they tell him that he has to pay the seven people for the seven coats.

When he shows the certificate saying that they were taken from him, "never mind."

So this business of clearing the eight departments of the eight municipalities, and then coming to the

central branch to get the final clearance is no small matter.

The Jews sit there in the bureaus and in the government offices, in front of the desk of the Romanian clerk, fearful, worried, another man holds their life at the end of his pen, and I tell you that you must succeed in communicating that mood, the mood in which the Jews of Romania find themselves.

You have to communicate that mood to your listeners, because it is an integral part of understanding this whole picture.

Good, he has made it, he has gone through the eight offices, he has that cleared.

Now he is stateless, he has no documents and he wants to leave. Now he has to get a laissez-passer -- a one-way document granted by the Ministry of the Interior -- I brought one back with me. It is a facsimile. Maybe we should get copies so all of you can see this thing.

It says "from the Minister of the Interior," it gives his name, the place he was born, under the item "profession or job" it is left blank, he has no job.

Under the thing of nationality, it is left blank, he has no nationality, and on the bottom it says "destina-

tion", and they write in "Israel".

The Ministry of the Interior. This Jew isn't going to Canada, he isn't going to Australia, he isn't going to Buenos Aires.

This is his only travel document. This costs him 315 lei per person.

Then it comes down to the question of what he is allowed to take out with him, and there are two categories.

If he is a worker, a proletariat, a builder of the socialist state, he can take more than if he is just a parasite, an intellectual, a non-contributor.

So the two categories are 40 kilos, which is 88 pounds, or 70 kilos, which is 154 pounds.

Only personal clothing, nothing else.

For this freight he is charged 6 lei per kilo. so if he has got 40 kilos, and there are four people in the family, 160 kilos, and it is six lei, 960, almost one thousand for his freight.

Then you see, because there are always new ways that you can think of to extract money from people, you prepare a box in which this Jew can put his miserable belongings. So for a box that will hold 40 kilos, you charge

him 300 lei, or for a box that will hold 70 kilos you charge him 500 lei. He pays for the box.

Then he goes down to the railroad station to buy a ticket. A ticket from Bucharest to Naples costs 500 lei. The exact price is 491. Children from five to twelve are half price. Children below five are free; like on any railroad.

You add up for a normal family of four, all of these costs and prices for all these documents on what is called a normal case -- normal. No abnormalities, no necessities to pay a husband's fine in jail, no paying for extra coats, no paying some fantastic sum of back rent on the apartment that belonged to a previous tenant -- because there is that kind of thing by the way, very often.

When you go to give up your apartment, you have to check with your flat and they look up all the eleven years who lived in that place.

If there was a previous tenant who owed rent, or who owed taxes, or who owed electrical bills, or who owed repairs or anything, you, the emigrating Jew, pay for the previous tenant who might have been Jew or non-Jew, or whoever he was.

Leave out all such abnormal extraordinary pressure payments. Take only what I have told you, where the Jew has no complications. He is a simple little Jew. He pays for his registration. He pays for his renunciation of citizenship.

He pays for his laissez-passer, he pays for his freight, pays for his box, pays for his ticket.

No more complications.

For a family of four, this thing runs on the average of ten to twelve thousand lei. He is earning 600 a month, and you don't live on it, so you don't save anything out of this great salary.

So what do you do?

I said that I would come to the question of the money. The Jews of Romania are selling out the beds on which they sleep. It is just as simple as that.

I walked through all the streets in the Jewish quarter and in front of every -- not every, but in many -- apartment houses, you can see paper up there with a list of what is for sale. I don't read Romanian, but radio is radio, and when you see it in German and it says "Schlafzimmer", it is a bedroom set.

They are selling clothing, furniture, lamps,

tables, radios, every single thing that is liquid.

In that kind of situation, where only the Jews are selling and only the non-Jews are buying, everybody knows why they are selling and everybody knows the duress and the pressures that are operating, and the prices don't go up in that kind of circumstance.

It is reaching the point where the market is becoming glutted, because the Romanians also are poor. You are not talking about a rich country. Everybody earns 600 lei, not just the Jew.

If the Jew is taking three rooms of furniture, which, on the average costs 12,000 lei, and he is trying to sell them even for 2,000 or 3,000, there aren't many buyers even at that price.

You go down to something that are called consignment shops. I had never seen one in my life. It is a place to which you bring a precious object, a set of china, a set of knives and forks. I am telling you things I saw in the window -- an oil painting. You bring it there, you leave it.

If they sell it, there is a fifteen per cent commission deducted from it, and the Jew gets the money.

The consignment shops are getting so full of

goods, they are not taking things from Jews any more, and Jews are trying to find non-Jews who will bring items down to the consignment shop and register it there under somebody else's name.

There was a way of getting help to these people. Cash, financial help. That way has been blocked off. New ways will have to be found.

This, good friends, is a very delicate matter. I think that you and I have to handle this item just simply as follows:

We have to assure our audiences that we may not divulge the ways and means by which money is made available to these people, but we are not raising a campaign in the United States for tens and hundreds of millions of dollars to put the money in the bank.

Believe me, and I make this as a flat statement, because it was given to me as a flat statement by the man on the continent of Europe -- and I won't say even where he is -- who is responsible for this fact. It was given to me this way and I give it to you this way.

No Jew will be left behind in Romania because he doesn't have the cash to pay for all these things.

No Jew will be left behind for lack of cash.

That is a solemn promise that was given to me by the one man in whose hands the fate of these people is, from the financial point of view.

I transmit that promise to you equally solemnly, and you can give it to our audiences.

There are times when the spelling out of details beyond that do more harm than they do good.

If our audiences don't want to believe us, then they won't believe that, and they wouldn't believe the detailed spelling out which would put the heads of many men in jeopardy.

So I say, the devil with it.

If they won't believe us, then they won't believe us if we expose men's lives on the carpet in front of them by telling them details that are nobody's business.

Nobody is kidding anybody on this. Money is the clue, the key that many people need to get out, because I have heard of almost no cases where a person was refused his documents.

Notice, therefore, again, what I am saying. If the 100 or 110 thousand people are registered now, and registration continues to be open, by the way -- sometimes once a week, sometimes twice a week -- therefore,

more and more people will be registered -- I have heard of almost no cases, almost no cases where people who registered that they wanted to leave, were turned down. There were some, but very few.

Therefore, it appears that this large number of people is coming out. It is on the basis of this that you have seen statements in the Press given by Mr. Ben Gurion, given by Mr. ^{Eshkol} Erkol (?) given by others, that Israel might this year expect perhaps 100,000 or 90,000, or 80,000, or 110,000 Jews from Romania.

Let me enter a footnote here.

Obviously there is something that could happen that could change this picture.

When I say that nothing prevents the Jew from coming out except money, the footnote that I must enter here obviously is that the picture might change politically, and that is not an empty thing.

We have to this day no authoritative explanation of why Romania opened up her doors. We have guesses. We have estimates, we have smart thinking, we have many people's shrewd evaluation, and if in the question period you want to go into that, let us -- I am skipping it because it is guesswork -- we have no hard data to inform

us as to why this decision was taken.

All that we know is that this was apparently a top-level policy decision, requiring the setting up of a big governmental machinery to handle it.

Just as we don't know the motivation as to why really they did it, so we will never know what might motivate them really to stop it, and that is always the possibility and that is the footnote of warning I enter.

I don't know whether that pays to say that to people, I really don't. I think that people understand that themselves, that you are dealing with a government whose ways are somewhat mysterious to our western mind.

I don't know if it adds steam or detracts steam from the presentation to put in that caveat, that it could stop at any moment.

Maybe Abe Harman would want to comment on that fact as to whether we should or should not include that in our presentation.

But, at any rate, that is the only appreciable thing that we can think of that would alter this picture.

With that number of Jews registered, and with the administrative machinery set up to handle them, and if nobody is held back because of lack of money, then the

reasonable assumption is that at whatever rate this progresses, whether it is 4,000 a month or twice 4,000 a month, the reasonable assumption is that we are in the midst of, or at the beginning of a historic process.

Where it will end, we don't know. Whether it will take us down to the last Jew in Romania, the whole quarter of a million -- nobody can predict.

I had conversations with the leading Communist Jews, the leaders of the Accexia(?), the Jewish section of the party who say, "There will always be a Jewish population in Romania."

It reminded me of the people who will say that there will always be an England.

The man was quite sincere and quite determined and he says that this will not be a complete liquidation. There are Jews to this day in Bulgaria. Yes, there are, there are 3,000. We took all the rest of them out.

There are Jews to this day in Poland. Yes, there are, but it is dwindling down very rapidly.

So there may always be Jews in Romania. I don't know whether this thing will go down to the last Jew.

The fact of the matter is that the whole population psychologically and spiritually is involved in this

exodus.

That is about the story as I think we need it for public presentation.

There are many other inside details which I think are not important for public presentation.

For instance, I think the fact that on the 6th of January the Israel Legation was surrounded by police and cordoned off, and the Jews who were in line in front of the building were arrested, and it was broken up, and there was no contact permitted, and no Jew can go inside the legation today without running the risk of being arrested -- either going in or coming out -- I don't know if you think that is something which will be revealing to people as to what the internal situation is; if you think it is, then tell it to them.

I don't know, for instance, whether it means anything, whether it adds anything to the story to talk about how the Romanians handled the question of personal documents.

No Jew is allowed to take out of Romania a personal document, a marriage certificate, a birth certificate, a medical diploma, an engineer's license, a transcript of a school record to show that he had so many

years of schooling -- no such personal documents can be taken out.

Why? They have no financial value.

I don't understand this kind of regulation, except on the basis of harassment, because if a man is an engineer and he doesn't have a paper to show that he went to M. I. T., when he goes to Israel and he says he is an engineer and somebody says to him there, "Well, prove it," he can't prove it, so there is an awkward mess in the absorption process of that technician, where either they have to take him on faith, and put him in a plant and maybe be afraid that he will mess up the works, or they don't want to take him on faith, and a good talent lies fallow before somebody discovers that he really is an engineer.

In other words, I think the removing of personal documents is only harassment.

One thing that we are not interested in doing -- and I am really laying the line down here, almost like laying the law down -- we are not interested in telling this story in such a way as to aggravate, to irritate, to provoke the antagonism of the Romanian government.

If there is one warning that I would give you in this thing, that is the warning. I am not saying that

you should whitewash them for what they are doing.

But I am saying that you must not, you dare not go out of your way to give this story with its full implications of harassment -- and that is why I don't know even if this business of the personal documents ought to be told, or not.

You dare not, and I dare not use words like "stripping", "robbing", "expropriating", although if you insist on being a semanticist, that is what is happening.

I came out on the Orient Express, the train, the famous Orient Express.

Fat chance. Two nights on that thing, and not a dining car, nothing to eat and do you know what I had? I had a bag of Jaffa oranges, bought in Bucharest, wrapped in nice paper from Israel. Morally sustaining as well as physically, believe me.

I saw with my own eyes the men taken off at the border and standing on the side of the track and the police inspector goes through the box with the lousy 40 kilos of clothes and then he sees that the man has a wedding ring on his finger, and he pulls off the wedding ring.

He weighs the wedding ring and he has two drams of gold -- two drams, mind you, so they take away the

wedding ring.

The Jew was quiet -- quiet, until you get across Cortije(?), and you get sixteen kilometers of no-man's land, and you get across into the Hungarian side, and then a burst came out of him.

Really -- I mean this was the final indignity. He cried, cried, cried, broke down in the compartment, and the kid, 16, 17-year-old kid -- you can see that the man has worn the ring twenty years -- pulled it off his finger.

I tell you these things, you see, out of the first part of the talk, because you don't know whether these things ought to be told to the people or not.

If they can be told, they can be told in a way so that nobody can quote you, a responsible speaker, for the U. J. A. Nobody can quote you as having said anything derogatory or inflammatory in regard to the Romanian government.

That is the caveat that we have to observe.

Because the price is very clear. If there is any whimsy in this situation, if they are able to turn the tap off the way they turn the tap on, then one of the things that will cause them to turn it off is if they get publicly accused, public accusation, or public condemnation

or public attack.

If you or I are speaking in Omaha and the newspaper reporter prints it and the stories and the clippings go back to the Romanian Embassy in Washington and they say that we are letting the Jews out and what do we get for it, we get attacked for it, then what is the sense of it?

This is a thing that we have to be very careful of.

All right. I have tried to give you the facts in the matter, and I promised myself that I would not get emotional, and if I did, you have to forgive me, because it is a very very terrible thing to see this.

I think that I gave you the facts in the matter about the internal situation, the process of getting out, the prospects and the prognosis for the future and the things we have to be careful of.

All I can tell you is that in Vienna you have this beautiful feeling of a life-saving operation conducted by wonderful guys who go down to the railroad station every morning at a quarter of seven, don't know how many people are coming in off the train, haven't got the slightest idea whether they are going to have fifty, a hundred

and fifty, or three hundred and fifty -- never mind. They have got some buses outside, they have got a couple of small hotels with fifty rooms where a person can lie down -- they have got food ready, warm rooms, take a bath, rest, pack up a picnic basket for the next leg of the journey, because it is 28 hours more from Vienna down to Naples.

And they give them what is the most important thing of all, beyond all the physical and material welcome, give them the Jewish welcome -- we are here. We are Jews from Israel, we work here, the Jewish Agency, and they hear Hebrew spoken, and they feel good, and the Jew on the train knows that he is home.

You cannot imagine what that means to him. He is still in Vienna, but he is home, because he is in the hands of people who love him and care for him and want him, and believe me that is important to stress.

I go one step further and I am not oversentimentalizing this either.

We have had American Jews down at the railroad station to meet them in Vienna, not just Israeli Jews, or Jews from the J. D. C. office -- American Jews.

You should have seen the way those American

Jews reacted to the people leaning out of the windows of the trains, and you should have seen the way those people reacted to the American Jews.

You are Americans, they say. What are you doing here? What in hell is an American Jew doing 4,000 miles away from home standing in a railroad station in Vienna?

Symbol. That is the symbol that you have to get across to the mind of every Jew in Dallas and Duluth and Brooklyn and Williamsburg.

He is the symbol, and if he is not standing there on that railroad station in Vienna, there is one hell of a big hole.

Then down in Naples it is easier. In Naples there are six, seven, eight days -- maybe less if a ship happens to be waiting there, but by and large, and they can get a real medical check in Naples, and it is a pleasure to watch it. They do chest X-ray and blood analysis, sugar analysis, the works -- really -- a fabulously quick medical operation in a few days, to put some kind of record on the boat, because you can't do anything inside Romania, and in transit down to Naples -- they are on the way, they don't wait in Vienna half a day, so in Naples there is your first chance.

051101224

You slip something in the jacket, the folder, the paper folder of this guy, and on the boat they have four, four and a half days to process this thing, and so when he comes into Israel, you have a record of who he is and what he did and his whole background and you can dig out what to do with him in the absorptive process, and having put him on the boat in Naples, I now put him into Abe Harman's hands, because everything that I have told you up to now is exactly half the story, one half.

What happens in Israel?

You can't be anywhere near as boring or long-winded as I have been in telling this, because I have taken the better part of three quarters of an hour to tell half the story, and he has to tell the other half of the story, and you have got to tell the whole story in twenty minutes.

You have got to take down and distil all this stuff and all these words and you have to pour it out of your pores, in a distilled way, and briefly -- and this is my last word -- you do it right, and if you do it right, the Jews of America are going to respond. We have seen it already, we have seen it already.

Maybe not the way that they should, but much

better if you get it under their skin than with a five per cent or ten per cent or twenty per cent normal increase.

No. There are chances here for real good money.

If the thing is done right and told right, because it is a powerful story, and it is a true story.

It is a story of great opportunity and great challenge, and that is our destiny.

I think that if we do it right, we will meet it.

I just want to wish everybody here the best of health in this campaign, because you are going to need it, and strong feet, and good heart and good courage.

Now I would like to have Abe Harman, whom you all know and love and cherish as much as I do, and whose coattail I will pull at periodic intervals, because he shouldn't yell like I do -- to talk about anything else that I have left out and pick it up from there and what the problems are in Israel, and when that is done -- never mind the collation -- when that is done, we will have questions and answers, and then we can all sit down and have a cup of coffee together.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

MR. HARMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, before get-

ting into the question of what happens to these immigrants on arrival in Israel, I would like to venture one or two comments about the story of their migration which was very vividly described by Herb Friedman.

I am a great believer in not running one shock campaign. Either we are going to be in business on this stand for a very long time, throughout this generation, I think, and I think, therefore, that it is very important indeed to put this whole story in its historical context, and about that I want to say just two things.

The whole nature of the problem of Jewish migration has completely changed in our times.

We have been used throughout our history, for many centuries, to assume that the problem of Jewish migration was a problem of finding an outlet for that migration.

The problem until eleven years ago was, Where could the Jew go?

With the establishment of the state of Israel, this problem has found an answer. Even Jews who don't particularly want to go to Israel can go there if they have nowhere else to go.

That problem, therefore, has receded, fortunately,

from its central position in the story of Jewish migration.

Because we were obsessed until eleven years ago by that question, we failed to notice that during the course of this century, for the first time, I think, throughout the course of Jewish history, as far as I can remember, since the days of antiquity, we noticed that there was a problem of how could Jews get out of certain places where they found life intolerable, either as individuals, or as Jews, or as both.

This is a problem which in the past few years has been facing no fewer than four million Jews, which is one third of the total Jewish population in the world today.

This Romanian story is part and parcel of this problem, and the importance of the Romanian story is that it is not the first evidence that we have had in the last few years of how this particular problem has found a solution, and of how and where the need for Jews to leave a country, and their desire to leave it is strong enough, it will ultimately prevail over the difficulties facing the way of an outlet for this migration.

You will recall that in 1956 the first big

break in eastern Europe occurred in Poland, the first big break since Jewish emigration from eastern Europe was cut off in 1951.

There was a similar break in the early part of 1957 for a certain period of time in Hungary.

Poland is the third instance of this break in eastern Europe, and the most important instance because the number of Jews involved is very much bigger.

Herb said a quarter of a million Jews are in Romania at the present moment.

And because Romania has always been an orthodox Communist country, which one wouldn't have said in 1957 about the Poland of Gomulka, which allowed a speedy exit to Jews wishing to leave that country.

I am saying this also because of the warning we heard and rightly heard from Herb Friedman about the pace of the emigration from Romania; it is not under our control, it is under the control of the Romanian authorities, and it may, therefore, conceivably be subject to fluctuation.

The thing that we have got to get across, I think, is: Is there evidence that the Jews of these countries want to migrate?

That is the basic factor. The fact that 100,000 Jews or more in Romania registered for emigration at the time when there was no certainty whatsoever that they would be granted exit visas -- and this is a very pertinent point -- the bulk of these registrations occurred at the end of September and during the course of October and November.

The large period of emigration following the granting of exit visas from Romania began really in December, so that at the time when the bulk of those Jews registered they had and could have had no certainty that they would actually be granted exit visas.

But they did have every reason to assume that the mere act of registration would bring in its train those penalties and risks about which we heard from Herb Friedman.

That fact, I think, must be taken as conclusive proof that there is a very large accumulated desire and need on the part of these Jews to leave those countries, Romania and the other countries involved.

As against that we have to ask ourselves, and this is, of course, pertinent to the question which Herb raised, as to why are they letting the Jews out.

0 3 3 0 1 0 1 5 0

We have to ask ourselves, is the desire and need of the Jews to leave a country like Romania, if that desire is as strong as that, it would be held up only if there were a stronger need on the part of the Romanian government to keep those Jews there.

It would appear from all the evidence that the reason why the permission to leave was granted when it was granted, why this process began when it did begin, was that in weighing the factors, the Romanian government apparently came to the decision that Jews were for today a dispensable element, and therefore, there was no overwhelming reason to hold up an outlet to this desire on the part of those Jews to leave.

I think that this historical background is needed, because the problem of the Romanian Jews may be with us next year, as certainly the problem of the absorption of the Romanian Jews who come to Israel in 1959 will certainly still be with us next year.

We have to prepare people, even in the heat of a special effort kind of campaign, which is so desperately needed this year -- nonetheless have to prepare them educationally and psychologically to an understanding that we are dealing here with a continuing situation.

051101231

The need for the overwhelmingly greater response this year is justified, not because the problem is new, but because the opportunity of doing something about solving the problem is fortunately this year, this year so very much greater than it was last year; that is the justification, not because it is a new situation fundamentally.

But, because there has been a breakthrough on this situation this year, and there might be a breakthrough on similar situations in other countries in the years that lie immediately ahead.

We don't want to place ourselves in a position where we constantly are being accused of dreaming up new gimmicks.

There is nothing gimmicky about this accumulated need of Romanian Jewry for migration, which has been suppressed for the last seven years.

The only new factor in the situation is that this year for a certain set of reasons, which have come together, the opportunity to leave has now been granted.

Even if, God forbid, that opportunity were to be cut off again tomorrow, the need for migration would be there, and the need to fight for its satisfaction would

be there; if we had the interests of these Jews at heart, and the degree of conviction that we could continue to have that ultimately, this is a problem which can only find its solution in those Jews winning the right to migration, that is a continuing situation.

That brings me to the second thing that I wanted to bring to your attention about the historical background of these events.

One of our greatest psychological difficulties, I feel, is that there is not, probably for natural reasons, a sufficient awareness among us, and I include Israelis in this generalization too, that, in effect, what is happening today as far as eastern European Jewry is concerned, is a delayed chapter in the story of the disintegration and reconstruction of Jewish life. That is really what it is.

Had the doors not been closed -- the exit doors -- in 1951, we would have been handling these Jews in 1951, 1952, and not in 1959 and 1960.

This is a direct consequence of the disintegration of European Jewry in our age, during the course of this century. It is a part of the same story that led to the mass Jewish migrations to the Western World

beginning in the eighteen-eighties.

It has its roots in the instinctive trend of Jewish history in our time. It is almost as though the spirit of Jewish history were saying that there are certain countries in the world today where Jews want to live and can live as free people and as Jews both, and other parts where they cannot do that.

The whole trend of Jewish history in the last three generations has been from Europe to America and Israel.

America I use topologically -- countries like America, which give the Jews the same opportunities to be free and not to cease to be Jews. Has America done it?

This is the transformation that the Jewish history has undergone in this century, and this story is an integral part of it.

Therefore, we must not permit ourselves to regard this as a calamitous episode. This is not. This is the wished-for continuation in the flow of Jewish history from disintegration to reconstruction on sound foundations.

This is a thing for which we have dreamed and which we need to transfer Jews from a situation of disintegration in the Jewish sense, to a set of conditions

in which they can be free as individuals, and constitute a constructive force for the assurance of the Jewish future.

This is what is happening.

Therefore, we must struggle against the tendency which one senses -- it is not very easy for people to express this tendency in so many words, it is not very nice, but one feels it at times somewhere at the back of people's minds -- to regard this as a burdensome thing; it isn't.

In terms of Jewish need, in terms of the strength of the Jewish people, in terms of the future of the Jewish people, this is the most advantageous and fortunate set of circumstances imaginable.

It would be better if they could bring out lift vans of goods as they were allowed to do from Poland. This is a subsidiary question.

But that we have Jews -- this is not a problem. This is a great good fortune.

I personally believe that these Jews are being permitted out of Romania for the internal reasons of the Romanian government.

There has been some speculation to the effect that this is a plan to choke Israel. They should continue

to choke Israel in this way.

(Laughter.)

Nothing could be better for Israel than to continue to be choked in this way.

(Continued on next page.)



Nothing could be better for the Jewish people than to have this opportunity of resuming contact, live, physical contact, and spiritual contact with hundreds of thousands of Jews from whom we have been separated and sundered for such a long time, and winning these Jews back to the body of the Jewish people.

These are very good Jews. I like all the Jews, whether they are regarded as good human elements -- some are more difficult than others -- (Laughter) -- but these are not particularly difficult. From many points of view.

The health standards of the Romanian Jews coming to Israel are very much superior to that of most previous mass unselected immigrations.

I don't know anybody who would like to suggest to the government of Israel that it should issue instructions to its legation in Bucharest not to issue an Israeli visa to any Jew who gets an exit visa, because this is sometimes the subject of discussion.

Should we have such a law in Israel, or shouldn't we have such a thing in Israel -- it is an academic question, because nobody, nobody at all, would like to be in the position of an Israeli consul in Bucharest who would have instructions that in these and these

circumstances you will not give a visa to a Jew who gets an exit visa in these circumstances. It is an entirely academic question.

So, once again, this is going to be an unselected mass migration. We will be taking out of Romania whoever gets out. Among them will be people who like to eat bacon for breakfast, possibly. (Laughter)

This may create some problems in Israel for some people. (Laughter)

Among them will be people with beards and payess as they are; they will come out as they are, and we will take them as they are.

But it is going to be in many respects a less difficult immigration to handle than many unselected mass immigrations that we have had.

I mention the health point of view. I could also mention the occupational point of view, although here I will make quickly one very important reservation.

The great distinction between this immigration and, let us say, the DP immigration that we got immediately after the establishment of Israel, is that here we are dealing with Jews who had for the last ten years or so -- even longer -- been part of an economy, for

the most part. They had been employed.

The great occupational and psychological problem of the DP immigration was that these were people in 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, as you will remember, I am sure, who for many years had not lived in an economy -- had virtually been living in prison and had not been occupied or employed.

Occupationally, therefore, this is on the whole going to be a much more tractable immigration.

Also because it is made up of -- again, I am generalizing -- people with fewer pretensions than those of preceding mass immigrations in recent years.

Herb Friedman mentioned the fact that there is only this one big city in Romania, Bucharest.

Therefore, the degree of urbanization among the Romanian Jews is rather less than, let us say, among the Polish Jews.

A larger percentage of people from small, very small provincial towns who had some flavor of acquaintanceship with agriculture.

It is possible, therefore, by no means certain, but it is possible, to forecast that we will have a bigger percentage of Romanian Jews who will settle on the

land than, let us say, among the Polish Jews, 40,000-odd Polish Jews who came to Israel in the last two and a half years.

One reservation that I want to make on this occupational position is this:

Quite a thick layer of the Romanian immigration to Israel already -- and we can expect this qualification to exist -- is made up of professionally qualified men and women. They came to Israel immediately after we have received a comparatively large number of similarly qualified people from Poland.

I think the total number of academically qualified men and women who entered Israel from Poland was of the order of 2,600; something like that -- doctors, engineers, lawyers, economists, accountants, actors, newspaper men, and so forth.

Their absorption was not easy on the whole. It was rather smooth, with exceptions.

Almost immediately after that, to deal with another, comparatively speaking, mass influx of people similarly qualified from the professional point of view, is going to impose obvious strains on us and on the people concerned.

After all, we are a small country, at the moment with only a population of 2 million people. And there is a limit to the absorptive capacity in certain areas of professional life.

There is an awful lot of, I think, rather imaginative, improvisation going on in Israel at the present time in this regard.

I would like to emphasize just one aspect of this improvisation, because I think that this also illustrates the significance of Israel, if I may say so.

A suggestion has been put to the government, which government is studying, together with the Israel Medical Association, and the various health bodies, Hadassah, and so forth, that all existing medical personnel in the country would desist from overtime, that the number of patients per medical man would be cut down so that instead of having one doctor, for example, for four rural villages, you would have only one for two villages. And so on and so forth, in order to create the possibility of absorbing doctors.

I think this is an unusual situation. I don't know of any country in the world which allows a doctor to come in, as Herb says, without a diploma, to set up a

medical board for the purpose of listening to him and having him prove that he is a doctor -- not by examination -- and immediately that proof is established, to give him a license to practice without an examination, and before he knows the language of the country; and to have at his disposal an agency which teaches him the language of the country, and to have the government and the medical profession strain itself in this way to create a job for him, when his mere presence in the country constitutes competition for somebody.

This is, of course, part of the answer why there is an absorptive capacity in Israel.

Another part of the answer is that the Histadrut -- and other labor unions -- grant immediate membership to this man. There is no calculation as to whether the swelling of that part of the labor population which is looking for a job at almost any price may not injure the prevailing standards and conditions of labor. I don't know of any parallel to this in any other country, which is also part of the reason why there is an absorptive capacity in Israel which sometimes surprises people.

There is -- I mentioned this question of the professionals, because I think it should be understood,

that this immigration faces in Israel certain questions which cannot be solved by money, which is why I think it is so desperately important that the problems that can be solved by money should be solved.

There are problems that cannot be solved by money. These are not young unmarried Bohemians who are coming to the country. These are normally constituted families. These are married men with children, and in some cases with dependent aged parents.

To attempt to adapt yourself to a new climate and a new language and to a new job, which is what faces a lot of the people, in their late thirties, the early forties, in their middle forties, is not an easy thing.

This is a problem which will not be solved by money. It will be solved by the atmosphere of integration that can be created in Israel. And a good deal of thought and attention is going into that.

But, if, in that situation, the problems that can be solved by money are not solved, we are creating for these immigrants an atmosphere which must drive them to bitterness, and which must render them a problem for Israel of enormous dimensions.

I said that these are people of few pretensions.

They don't ask for very much.

The standards of housing that satisfy them are, by American standards, very small. We gave the Polish Jews for a family of four or five a house which had a gross floor space of about 420 square feet. There were never complaints from the Poles about housing.

There were sometimes complaints that it wasn't in Tel Aviv, that it was in Demona, (?) but not about the house itself.

We will have fewer complaints, we reckon, from the Romanians that we don't send them all to Tel Aviv.

We have had some experience about this. First of all, there are some new towns in Israel in development areas which are becoming quite big towns, and they are acquiring the character of big towns, like Beersheba. Beersheba even attracted Polish immigrants, because it has already the feel of a big town.

The Romanians will be very happy to go to Beersheba, and to live in an apartment of 420 square feet.

We have already cut down this standard, because we don't see how we will ever have the money, even with \$100 million UJA campaign to provide 420 square feet. We are consoling ourselves with the knowledge that the

families of Romania are on the average a little bit smaller than Polish families. I don't know why this should be so, there must be some historical reason for it. But this is the case.

The average family is about 3.2 at the moment. That means that some have four, but many have three, in the family.

So the planning that is on the boards today is to cut down the floor space to 280 square feet for a family of three to four.

That will, of course, cut the costs down.

But it will be what we call hard building, a stone building, a permanent building, to which, in the course of years, you may be able to add a room or so.

We do not see the money for this.

In the Jewish Agency, in the United Jewish Appeal, we are doing something which I don't think we have the right to do. I don't think the Jewish people have the right to do it.

We are passing a lot of this financial burden for housing on to the government of Israel. The net effect of that, of course, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that the government of Israel is taking that money from its

development budget. This is a very serious thing.

You have a development budget in Israel which has already been supplemented for the financial year beginning the first of April 1959, which has in it 102 million Israeli pounds for housing.

Now, development budgets should be used for development. You can't eat houses.

It should be used for irrigation, for industrial development, for agricultural development, which you can eat, and which you can export.

And if you throw this burden on the government of Israel, you are holding up the possibility of economic self-sustenance for Israel. This is what is happening.

Unless there is an enormously better response to the United Jewish Appeal this year, this will happen. And it may happen to the extent where the government of Israel will not be able to cope with it in permanent housing, and where it will put up so-called transitional housing, temporary housing.

I want, if you will give me another few moments, to say a word or two about the ma'abarot. This is very complicated. It is not a simple subject. And I am afraid it is rather misunderstood. I think I would like

to try to clear it up in a few moments, for you, at any rate. I don't venture to suggest how this should be presented to the public.

The ma'abarot, as its name in Hebrew means, is transitional, and there are all kinds of transitional housing in Israel. We are engaged in Israel at the moment in destroying some transitional housing, and in building new transitional housing; and this seems paradoxical, but it has a rationale. The rationale is this:

In the period 1949 to 1951 or 1952, and at the peak of that period, we had a quarter of a million people in Israel living in transitional housing, transitional housing was established at first in the form of tent housing, and then in the form of canvas wall housing; and then in the form of tin shacks, and finally, in the form of wooden shacks.

People went through all these gradations until most of them graduated into permanent homes.

But there are at this moment in Israel in certain concentrations of these transitional housing called ma'abarot, which has become a technical term, if you like -- there are still about 100,000 people who,

since 1951 or 1952, have been living in so-called transitional houses.

The government of Israel, about a year and a half ago, decided to liquidate this within a period of three years. The first year is over about in April 1959 and will see the replacement of, I think, about 7,000 units of that transitional housing.

That cannot any longer be held up. It must be regarded as a priority on any housing requirements of the government of Israel.

It is quite impossible to tell a man who has been living in the chilly room ma'abara since 1952 that he cannot be permanently rehoused after six, seven years because a Romanian Jew got off the plane yesterday.

Therefore, the government has decided to stick to its three-year plan of the liquidation of the ma'abarot, however many Jews come into Israel and whatever their housing requirements may be; which is resulting in the fact that in the last few months already Romanian Jews have been absorbed on arrival in wooden shacks, newly reconstructed, and in some cases also in tin shacks.

Fortunately, up until now, people so housed have been put to work immediately on their arrival in the

country, building their own permanent homes across the road, or in the immediate vicinity, which has served the double function of sustaining their morale, and of providing them with their initial employment.

If funds were available for permanent housing, it has an immediate impact on dealing with the immediate employment problems of a large segment of the immigrant population, until permanent development can be set in motion to create permanent jobs for them.

The immediate prospect facing us in Israel is that as from about May, maybe a little earlier, it will depend on the pace of the immigration, we may reach a situation where we will absorb immigrants in wooden shacks, and in tin shacks in greater number than at the moment, without being able to put them to work within a very short time on building their own permanent housing developments.

And where, after a couple of months, they will realize that they are in this temporary housing for a considerable period of time.

I don't want to weary you with figures; just as I suggest you don't weary the public with statistics.

But the average cost of taking this Jew by the

hand from the railroad station at Vienna, per head, to a permanent home of 420 square feet for himself and two or three other members of his family, up to the door of the labor exchange, is \$1,600.

If it is going to be 100,000 Jews this year, it will be \$160 million.

I don't know if this is a good thing to say to speakers who are on the eve of going out on a tremendous campaign, but as an Israeli, I must say that you are going out for a regular campaign of \$102 million; and a special campaign of \$100 million for another 100,000 Jews.

If you were to give me a check today for \$202 million, we would do a very nice job. (Laughter)

What would happen? You would have an excellent campaign. I hope that -- I shouldn't open my mouth to Satan, as we say in Hebrew -- that you will have a wonderful campaign; that you will do very much better than last year, or that even in 1957, which seems to have become a new peak. And you won't give us either \$102 million, or \$100 million. But we will have the 100,000 Jews. (Laughter)

And you will have created what is called now in the technical language of the UJA and the Jewish Agency,

an unmet need, which lies on our backs.

He is not adequately housed. He is not adequately absorbed in the economy of the country. He is grappling with all kinds of social problems which are capable of being solved by money, but which have not been solved.

So when we will come next year and say, look, there aren't 100,000 immigrants in 1960, but, look, this is an unmet need, we will be confronted with this new block to an understanding of the realities of absorption, which is well. Israel is not running away; it will be all right.

But it won't be all right. This will hold up the economic development of Israel.

It could have the effect, if the money for the initial reception is not made available, of pushing back the day of economic independence for Israel. It could have the effect, if the money is not made available for the reception and the economic absorption, not of strengthening Israel, but of weakening Israel, even militarily.

This is how this problem is having its impact on us in Israel.

I believe that as a practical proposition you sell Jews more cheaply in Israel than you do in New York. If they were in New York in a shelter of NYANA, they would be so much on your neck that the money would be found for them; but when they are 6,000 miles away, they can be living as 100,000 are living in ma'abarot for six or seven years. But this doesn't seem to grip anybody.

But it creates for Israel a source of social complication of the gravest consequence for which we may have to pay a great deal in the years ahead, as we deal with children who are born in slums and brought up in slums.

I don't think these people deserve this, and I don't think that the country deserves it.

The solution to this question could be the attainment of the United Jewish Appeal goals. I think it most important, indeed, to try to bear home the message to our people that these goals are also not gimmicks; and if the \$100 million special target is not attained, that money will be needed, and it will constitute an unmet need of two kinds.

Somebody will have to borrow some of that money, and accept an obligation to repay, he doesn't know from what; and that is partly how we financed immigration and

absorption in the last ten years, with the result, I can tell you this, that in the financial year beginning the first of April 1959, before the Jewish Agency can do anything for a Romanian Jew, it has to pay 50 million pounds in debt repayment and service, and interest charges on the account of the unmet goals of previous years.

And the second way in which we will make up the backlog in the target will be in terms of human suffering and degradation.

Because it is a degrading thing to live in ma'abarot, and bring up children in the ma'abara; and it is a shocking thing to have left Romania for the reasons for which these people have left Romania, and to introduce their children into a situation of temporariness in housing and in employment.

This is a soul-searching thing, and it must leave its effect.

This is the situation which we face in Israel. I think it should be said that we are doing what we can in Israel, perhaps not as much as some of us think, to mobilize our own resources for this.

There are some very good Jews in Israel who tell me that I have too high a standard of living. I am not

very aware of it, but from an abstract point of view, I must agree with them. It is too high in the sense that it is apparently higher than we can afford. So we will try to cut down the standards of living in Israel, in practice, without saying so, by using a number of gimmicks, one of which is the present voluntary loan of 20 million pounds, which is being paid to the Jewish Agency.

A man who is earning about 320 pounds a month net is being told, as you tell people in campaigns, that a man in his income bracket, you should understand, should buy at least a 100 pound immigration loan bond from the Jewish Agency.

And everybody does it. So he signs a chit to the treasurer, and it is taken off his salary in four payments. He has already been told today in the Press and from the platforms of Israel that the 20 million pounds will clearly not be enough, and that he will have to pay more.

We will try and get this money out of him, if possible, not through taxation.

I can speak here freely because it is all off the record. But I assume that if we can't get it in any other way, we will have to have recourse to some kind

of direct or indirect taxation, because the money will have to be found.

I think it should be made clear to the public here that we are not asking for an extraordinary effort on the part of American Jewry before having made an extraordinary demand on our own people.

If we don't get a response from our own people, we shall probably just have to tighten the screws of taxation.

Those, I think, are the main points I wanted to get off my chest.

I would just like to end with one or two other brief remarks.

One is perhaps a repetition of what I have said, but I think it may bear repetition. A year or so ago, we pleaded with the UJA Study Mission in Israel, at a time when there was no immigration, practically no immigration, 1,500 a month, if you may remember.

We said, let us use this opportunity to clear the decks; liquidate the ma'abarot, get rid of our burden of debt, absorb the unabsorbed, so we will be ready for the inevitable burdens of a new immigration.

One of the great difficulties of our job today

is that we meet this new immigration not only without reserves, but with an accumulated deficit of unmet needs.

Myself, I don't know how you divide this between the regular fund and the special fund. But I think that something has to be said about the two situations. Somehow or other, it has to be slipped in. Because if immigration were -- God forbid -- to stop to Israel, we would still have this big thing on our plate. And I think some opportunity has got to be found how to expose this situation -- not in the short time we have, but that has to be found.

The last thing I would like to say, to underline what Herb Friedman said about this -- and I want to say two things.

There is a temptation to simplify situations which are not simple.

For example, everybody would love to be able to say that there is an expulsion of the Jews from Romania. This is not technically an expulsion of the Jews from Romania. There may have been one, two cases where somebody was presented with a passport who didn't apply. It is not more general than that.

The essence of the situation is that in the

circumstances which Herb Friedman has described, and without any certainty of being able to get out, this vast mass of Romanian Jews asked to be allowed to leave. They don't do things like that without a reason. So there is a pressure in the atmosphere, in the climate.

You can't put your finger on it in the form of a decree or a diktat, but it is equally significant that there is an atmosphere from which Jews in such large numbers wish to find an escape.

The last point I want to make about publicity is this. Publicity about why Jews are leaving Romania, how Jews are leaving Romania, can damage their ability to leave. If we have to choose between the money and not the Jews, or the Jews and not the money, we will always choose the Jews and not the money.

We must find somehow an opportunity of speaking to Jews without the Press overhearing. Otherwise, we cannot conduct our business in Jewish life.

I believe that there is such an opportunity, and people have got common sense.

This story has got to be told to the widest possible number of Jews, but kept from the Press, in our name.

Some correspondent picks up a story in Vienna -- that is O.K.; we are not responsible for that.

We can reprint it, it may be useful. But we are not responsible for it.

And every man, and woman, in this room is an official source. And we are all official sources. These Jews don't belong to Israel, they belong to the Jewish people. And we are all responsible for them. Every responsible Jewish organization is responsible for them.

I believe that if this situation is put up to our people in this way, we will get the response of understanding and the feeling that is required, and above all, let us try to get our people to understand that, unlike many other people also that were affected by the war, our reconstruction period isn't over, and this Romanian episode, because it is only an episode in a long story, is merely a further desirable and providential installment in this story of Jewish reconstruction, which is the task of our generation to complete.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, the floor is open for questions.

If anyone has any questions of fact, of substance, of interpretation, we would be delighted to have them now.

A VOICE: How can you possibly counteract the publicity given by the Council for Judaism that we are trying to lure people into Israel?

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I don't know if you all heard it; the question was, how can we possibly counteract the propaganda of the American Council for Judaism that we are trying to lure people into Israel?

I don't think it needs any answering. I think the facts speak for themselves. Nobody lured the Romanian Jews to register. They registered because they wanted to, as Mr. Harman explained in great detail, on the basis of their need so to do. I think that is a sufficient answer, if each one of us is well armed with it.

I have a question, if you don't have any.

My question is this -- and it is a serious one. I would like to know whether you people, as I have often thought and put this to myself, whether you or I as speakers can do anything more in a meeting than just to make our speech.

Now follow me. Abe Harman said we are all

spokesmen. And we are all spokesmen. We are booked at a meeting, we go to a meeting; we are asked to make a speech.

Can you or I do anything more at that meeting than just wait to be called upon, speak our twenty-minute piece, sit down, and finish?

It seems to me this is very important.

We are not just tape recording machines, to go to a meeting and speak back what we know, which is a great deal more than the audience knows.

Are we active agents in changing the course of that meeting in any way?

That is the question I want to put to you. All of you have had a lot of experience. Do any of you want to try to offer any help, any suggestions to each other, as to how we can do more at a meeting than just make our speech?

May I acknowledge the presence in the room -- before there is an answer to that -- of Mr. Simcha Pratt, the Consul General of Israel; Mr. Simchon Arad (?), the Consular member of the staff, who has liaison relationships with the UJA; Mr. Gaidon Sagi (?), who is about to answer the questions, who is one of our most abused Israelis in

America, in terms of the number of speaking engagements we impose upon him; and other members of the Israeli Consular Staff who are here, whose names I am sorry I am not calling, but who are very well known.

MR. GIDON SAGI: In answer to your question, Herb, I am very glad that you brought this up. I had hoped that this would not only be a story of Romanian Jewry, but also on the point of organization to which your question belongs.

I think that anybody in this room who goes to a meeting anywhere in the United States does not do his duty. I have just returned from two meetings this morning of which one was at Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Sam Daroff, of Philadelphia, and I, who was there earlier, could have done a much better job than we did. The answer to your question is, by all means, if we go to any community, let us come there a little bit earlier, a few hours earlier.

I don't think it would make any difference in our jobs, because all this is extracurricular activity, anyway, and let us canvass the people, those of us who can, to go with you, in advance, three, four, five important people of this or that community. Let us

talk to them in advance in their homes, in their businesses, and perhaps we can do better than we did.

I think that we ought to do that.

The second thing is the question I would like to pose to you and to the UJA as an organization:

Couldn't we do better from the point of view of not wasting manpower or utilizing manpower better than we do?

The second community I went to on this tour was West Palm Beach. That very same day there was a meeting for top givers in that community for which, as you probably know, Bill Rosenwald was in town. It was just by accident that I met Mr. Rosenwald at the hotel. And I think I was material in bringing him, even if it was only for a few moments, to that meeting of the prominent people.

I think such things, if they are set up, should be utilized.

The third thing in which I think this particular campaign, for reasons unknown to me, is sorely lacking, is visual aid material.

I think the time has arrived that the UJA should send out posters, should send out slogans.

It is not possible that a meeting should be held in this situation with which we are faced, that you should not have a poster on the wall like the one you have, of a life saved, of freedom; you know the one with the faces, that glare into your own face, these people in the audience, so that they can see what you are talking about, and you can use it as a wonderful vantage point in your speech. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Gidon, you were only in Florida in one day -- and two communities. It is a good time of the year to be in Florida.

A VOICE: It was raining.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: First of all, a very good comment about getting there earlier. We are simply going to have to restructure ourselves organizationally so that the people in the office don't automatically look for the last plane on the timetable, as they do, not in defense of this system, let me say; but we also have a bureaucracy, like everybody else does, and we are always under the impression that you people would like to take the last possible plane to save yourselves time.

If, as you tell me now, you are willing to take the first plane, or the night-before plane, then I will

have to shuffle up our bureaucracy a little bit and not have them take the last one on the schedule, but one eight hours earlier, to give you the time to get there earlier, to do the kind of individual soliciting you are talking about before the meeting.

As far as the second point you mentioned, of visual aid, you all remember the good luck that we had with that Polish film a year or so ago -- and when I say good luck, it was good luck, because, you know, you put the thing together and you don't know if it will go across. And it went across with a bang.

We have got now, and I mean literally now -- I am going to see the finished film tomorrow -- we have got now a film on Romania. This, again, may be good luck; it may be bad luck.

We took -- there was no possibility of shooting inside Romania, as we did inside Poland, but we did do some shooting at the railroad station in Vienna and on the train down to Naples, and on the boat at Naples, last October and November, not knowing at that time whether the thing would evolve into what it is today, or whether we were wasting a few hundred dollars; and we would have to throw it all out.

As it turns out, it was good foresight to have made the decision then. We have got a finished film now. It is done. I have not seen it. I have seen rough cuts.

The edited product is on the way from Hollywood right now, tonight; and we are looking at it tomorrow.

It also has in it not just the contemporaneous scene of the Romanian Jew, but as Abe Harman put it into context -- and as I always want to put it into context -- we have got some film that we took out of captured German store that was shown at the Nuremberg Trial in 1946, and we have put about a minute or a minute and a half of that into the picture, to remind people, to remind people.

The thing runs 12 minutes. Therefore, if it is good, there should be no meeting -- practically no meeting -- at which a 12-minute film can't also be included in the program. It is not 20 minutes, not 30 minutes. We kept it short on purpose.

We may, therefore, be able to have for you tomorrow, a little early, the visual aid of a good film.

Certainly, about posters and things, we are in the works now with all sizes: big, little, big wall montages -- and no meeting should be without that face glaring down from the wall -- and I will certainly

take this comment very carefully.

MR. SEITLAN: It is really with a great deal of hesitancy that I rise, because we know that the average speaker is sensitive to tell another speaker who has a reputation and ability to put a message across as to how it might be done.

But I recall reading only the other day an article in which Zionism was traced, and the emphasis was placed upon the transition from that phase of Zionism, where speaking was all-important, to the new approach where action is all-important.

I would just like to take one of the suggestions that was made, the excellent suggestion of the speaker in terms of visual aid and think of it not only from the point of view of having a dramatic poster appeal to the audience, but bearing in mind that an average audience, with all due respect to the generosity of the audience, the average audience is a little tired of what the layman sometimes calls the "broken record."

We have evidence that they come to a meeting, a film is shown, and the chairman may say, "Let us make it short, let us have the addresses brief," with all due regard for the ability of the speakers.

Maybe we could use this dramatic approach of visual aid in the speech itself, rather than just words; maybe some of the dramatic technique could be used in the type of talk given.

These documents, with a certain amount of reservation, these documents might have a very impressive reaction on the audience. These various techniques, where we seem to minimize the gimmick.

We know what the goal is, but the gimmick is very vital.

Maybe through the promotion department, with an attempt to change the nature of the speech, the speech that is given by the person who is making the appeal -- this might be effective.

A final point. Here, again, with the greatest respect for the ability of all assembled, it might not be a bad idea for us to have a tape recording of some of the addresses we make. Whether this is done with our knowledge or without our knowledge. It is a good thing to hear ourselves, and constantly think of the resistance that we have to overcome by virtue of the fact that people have heard the story over and over again.

True, there is a variation, there is an attempt

to show that this particular year the need is different, the demand is so great, and this is a positive approach.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Let me take these suggestions. I have been marking them down.

MR. SEITLAN: I assure you it is said with all due respect.

The final point, if I may make it: I hate to make any personal allusions, but just last year -- I thought maybe this year I will be a little different -- in that I worked out an acrostic. This is a simple device -- an acrostic, just by way of experimentation. UJA. And for the U, the J, the A, there was a definite reason for giving.

It is amazing how people seem to respond -- and, believe me, I am not saying this to be vainglorious -- I know the talent of all of you. But these techniques may be useful.

MR. HIRSCHMAN: I want to make this brief. I think in all these years I know a little bit about Romania. I think you have the most explosive story that you have had yet. I think you know I was there in some earlier days, and I can't imagine a more dramatic money-raising story than the one that you have now.

I believe if you could have had your American Jewish audience in this room tonight, you wouldn't have had to have any speakers, and you wouldn't have had to have any campaign. And I say that not as a compliment.

I notice that you have a man here who is taking down every word of it.

If we could get in excerpt form just a few of the essential remarks, giving some of the color and some of the background, and, of course, some of the material that can be disclosed that you have revealed from your personal, on-the-scene experience, and the other side of the picture that Abe revealed, the otherhalf of it, so that we could have available for ourselves and even for distribution to some private meetings or for discussion, I think this should not be lost. I think it is too good. I think it is too good even just for us -- frankly, it should have been saved, perhaps, for others.

But I would like to suggest that some of these excerpts be edited and provided for your speakers.

One other point, as quickly as I can make it.

I think your Jewish audiences are almost thirsty for something as new and interesting and as provocative and receptive as this. But I find them extremely

ignorant about what Europe and Eastern Europe is, and where Romania is, whether you could have some map or additional material -- not only posters -- but to indicate where Romania is, where it is in relation to that whole area and where it is in relation to Israel.

I think this kind of information is necessary. They are getting confused by the various countries.

But I am especially impressed with what was said here tonight, and the desirability of capturing some of these nuggets for reproduction for audiences.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Ira, let me say this, that we will take this stenotype record and we will edit the thing down, and Arthur will get the thing together in some kind of form to get out to you, and you will have it in printed form.

MR. JOHN GROWELL: In answer to your question, Herb, about what we can do, I think we have already, some of us, talked over this business of getting into a community early.

But responsibility for doing a job rests with the field. We should be instructed, whether that memo comes with our travel sheet or something, we should know what we are going into. We are willing to go in early. We

will sit down with a big giver who is a little difficult to handle, to discuss his gift.

These things have to be arranged with us ahead of time.

Not too long ago, I went into your own home town where you know there is a difficulty. I addressed the cabinet, I had some difficulty -- I didn't know until after the meeting was over this question of cuts and how many hundreds of thousands of dollars were involved. I think we should know ahead of time, and I think if the field man thinks that we should sit down with the Chairman or with the big giver -- we are willing to give the time, but we cannot go in cold. We also have to go in with the dignity accompanying us as representatives of the United Jewish Appeal, not just a speaker who is coming in to make a speech, to grab the train as quickly as he can and get back out of town again.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I got you, John. You want better and fuller field information so that you can do a more effective job prior to the meeting.

MR. GROWELL: Even the report from the cardex for the last two years.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Leo Lanier had his hand up.

MR. LANIER: I hate to sound cynical, but I feel that I should utter a note of warning.

In listening to Abe Harman, one could see that there are actually two approaches to the problem. Of course, they are not contradictory, but where lies the emphasis? The first part is the importance to us; that means to the Jews of the world and Israel, of these Romanian Jews.

The other is the danger that Israel faces if we don't come through in solving that problem, because then actually it may become a terrific burden and danger to Israel itself.

Speaking of my personal experience -- and as you know, I have some personal experience in this matter --

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: A small amount, Leo --

MR. LANIER: I must tell you frankly, as cynical as it sounds, but speaking to the Jews of America today -- I am not speaking of those who are already on our side who have a very big heart for the Jewish cause, to whom all that what you said means a lot emotionally -- but, unfortunately, due to the past few years and to the many campaigns, the emotional appeal has worn off. And I doubt very much that you will raise that kind of money

just on appealing to their sentimental and inner relationship to Romanian Jews. But I feel very strongly that parallel to that development has risen among the American Jews a very strong feeling for the danger that as Americans they may run into if something happens to the State of Israel.

I feel that the second part of Harman's speech, the spelling out in detail of the implications of a failure of the campaign in letting Israel be buried, as it were, in that problem -- I feel that this is much more effective, and I must, as much as I admire Ira Hirschman, add that I am -- I frankly don't believe that you can move the American Jews -- I am speaking of those, the vast majority; please don't misunderstand me -- those who are "callous" -- you cannot move them just by dramatizing the Romanian story per se. You can only go places if you relate it directly to the future and to the faith of American Jewry, to the very great problems that these American Jews read about in their problems in the daily newspapers when they understand more and more of what Israel means as a democratic outpost, to the very existence of democracy.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Leo, you are quite right.

That is why this presentation was made in two parts. It isn't enough to tell the Romanian story and of the Jews in trouble there, simply.

The other part must be told, and each one of you is an artist to tell the thing in his own way, and each one devises his own framework. This fact, this presentation, this sounding the alarm of Israel herself being in danger, must come out -- must, and each of us must give it the way which you can with your own style of presentation.

MRS. RUTH GRUBER MICHAELS: I think what both of you have said tonight is so important that if we can distill that into our talks in the framework of our own experiences and of our own knowledge, I think the speech itself will not be the problem.

As I understood the question that you threw out to us, it was not so much the speech as what additional things could we do before the speech or after the speech to bring in that extra money.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: That is it.

MRS. MICHAELS: Each of us has his own techniques, his own integrity, each of us has his own personality. What may be good for one person may be

utterly ridiculous for another.

I can only tell you a few of the things that I have tried and have had some success with.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Do me a favor. Come up here to the microphone so everybody can hear you.

You have as much experience as anybody, and when you say you have a few things, I want everybody to hear those few things.

MRS. MICHAELS: First of all, the business of the field. The field, I feel, is vastly overworked. I don't think we have a right to ask them when they are working as hard as they are, to send us information in advance on the meeting. But the minute I get into a community, I am met by a field man. We sit in his car, and as we drive from the airport to the hotel, and the first questions that I think anyone normally asks a field man are: What kind of meeting is it going to be? How large will it be? Who is going to be there? Are these people who are interested in Israel? Is this a Council of Judaism community? What do I face? Who is the chairman, who is going to call the cards?

Does the chairman know that if he makes a speech after I am through, I will kill him? (Laughter)

Does he know that every single minute that is wasted after your speaker is finished, if the speaker is at all effective, you can almost hear \$500 bills fly out the window? These are the things you can take up with a field man when you are driving to the hotel, or in the half hour or hour that you are sitting together and warming up and drinking coffee.

In New York we have a different problem; and a lot of us here speak in New York and in the field. In New York the field men don't meet us at the airport. We meet them right at the meeting itself. And I think perhaps we can talk to them very quickly before the meeting starts and get them to write down for us the name of the chairman, the name of the guest of honor, and try to mention them in our talk. Because nothing pleases a man more than when you mention him inside your talk itself.

Then you say to the field man, "Isn't this a good card caller?" And then he says to you he is very good. And you sit back and relax, and then he says to you that he is terrible, can you help? And that is when I think the speaker has to really come through. Everything you have done in your speech is wonderful; you have given your all, you have told this magnificent Romanian story. And

if every speech and every meeting had Herb and Abe, none of us would have to do any work. But we don't have Herb and Abe at every meeting. So we all have to give what we can. And then when we are through, the chairman gets up and he decides that he should interpret what you have said to the audience -- and this is one of the natural wonders of public speaking.

Then he introduces the card caller who thinks it behooves him to explain what the chairman really meant, before he starts card calling.

So all this you work out beforehand with the field man, and if the field man is scared of his chairman, as very often he is, because the chairman can often be a tyrant, then it is up to us as speakers who don't have to live in those communities and who never have to talk to those chairman again, to go over to them and say, "Look, look, this is a really tough year, this is a great emergency, this is the way we ought to run the meeting tonight. I know I have no right to tell you this, you are the chairman. But look, couldn't we handle it this way? You introduce the card caller before you introduce me. The minute I finish speaking, I will say, 'Mr. Cohen' -- or whatever his name is--'is now going

to ask you what you will give'" -- and I don't give the chairman another minute to get up. And I don't give the card caller a minute to get up. And if I think he is going to make a speech, I get up beside him and I say, "I will call a couple of cards for you, do you mind?" And you sort of get that speech out of his system. (Laughter)

Then, maybe he is a wonderful card caller, and he has done a magnificent job. But there is always more money in the room. Don't kid yourselves. They never have really squeezed them dry.

So that is when you also get up again. You talk to the field man before the meeting, and you say to him, "Is there a chance for a second round?" And the field man says, "Wonderful chance." And then you say, "Can we discuss it with the chairman?" And he says, "I will discuss it." Or he says, "You discuss it; you are going to sit next to him at dinner, you take it up with him."

Well, you work out -- you have to play all these things by ear. The card caller may say, "Over my dead body will you have a second round. I promised these people there will never be a second round."

So you say to yourself, "After all, maybe -- you don't want him to die -- but still -- (Laughter) --

you are going to save Israel.

You know, when you come into communities, when Arthur Fishzohn sends us out to Miami or Memphis or St. Louis, they give us such a build-up, you would think Messiah was coming in. And we come in and really have to live up to this kind of build-up. And they really expect something. And that is when we can get together with them and do a job.

In these gimmicks, I have found that the Romanian situation, we can use the gimmick of flying them out of Romania.

We can fill up airplanes.

When we were flying them out of North Africa, when we were flying them out of Yemen, in every trade, in every community, we got airplanes filled up, and the price of the passengers always depended on the market. If it was a rich community in Memphis, maybe, it was \$1,000 a head. And maybe it was a poorer community, only \$100 a head -- who cares? -- you filled up an airplane.

It was \$50 a child. If you got to a women's luncheon, you knew they would die if you said \$100. So you said \$50. And immediately you get additional people. Because you are building up a big airplane and you are

putting the name of the guest of honor on the airplane.

I don't know how many airplanes, Arthur, we sent from all over the country to Israel. And now, with this Romanian crisis, we can really do that all over again.

You know, it has a very good result. At first the chairman will be scared of it, and the card caller will be scared of it. But then they find it is like going to Las Vegas. During the card calling they have given the heavy money, they have given the thousands and thousands of dollars. But when the card calling is all over, and you jump up spontaneous-like -- it just hit you in the eye -- and you say to them, "I am so overwhelmed by the way you have handled this and this outpouring of money, I have just had a bright idea. Couldn't we save Jews from Romania in a plane and name it after our guest of honor?" And then they feel as if they are just throwing out silver dollars.

Remember we had a furniture meeting -- Henry, you were there when Nat Sachs was still alive, and I had said to Nat Sachs, who at the beginning was not in favor of this, but I said, "Nat, if we could only get a plane filled up, we could really get a lot of extra money."

He said, "How much will it cost?" And I said

\$100 a person. And he said, "All right, I will put the first ten people on your plane."

Then when I got up, I had my shill -- you just need one -- and I got up and I said, "I want to make this plane the Furniture Division of New York," and Nat immediately said, "I will put the first ten people on it."

Then every other president of every furniture company in New York City had to put another ten on; they couldn't let Nat Sachs get away with it.

Then there were the vice presidents of all the firms, they began to put people on the plane. And then the salesmen began to put people on the plane.

We raised about \$30,000 extra after the good, hard money was in, just with gimmicks.

We have used Eban's book as a gimmick -- also whatever the market will bear.

In some trades we have even gotten a thousand dollars a copy for Aubrey's book -- he never thought he would get that much. (Laughter)

Most of the time the ceiling is \$100. And sometimes we get it down to \$50 and \$25 -- we have even used my book. Gimmicks can also be dangerous.

I remember a tobacco meeting last spring. The

chairman of the meeting said to me, "Can we do a second?" And this was my third appearance. And he said, "No, I am going to do the second round. I am going to pull something you're going to love."

So, all right, this is a group in New York, sophisticated, they know all the answers. So after the funds were all in, the chairman got up again very dramatically, took out a gun, held it to his head, and he said, "If nobody gives additional money, I am going to shoot myself." (Laughter)

Nobody gave additional money. (Laughter)

So you have to be careful. Really, you also have to be very careful of what you say.

I remember I went into one community with Gene Pollack, one of the best field men out. And Gene said, "Ruth, this is a tough community; you have to give them both guns."

So I did my best. And in the middle of the talk, a man had a heart attack. So he said, "I said, give them both guns. I didn't say, Shoot them dead." (Laughter)

But these are the things you can do inside of a meeting. You can stay to the end. I think speakers who make dates to go out before a meeting is over are

really abusing their responsibility to the community and to Israel.

I think that you have got to stay until the last penny is in. Because people will leave if the speaker leaves.

I think you have to come at the beginning and help them -- you know, there is always the question in New York, should you give them liquor or shouldn't you give them liquor? And at what point should you say no more liquor?

I think you should walk around with them and talk to them, and maybe find out who are the difficult people and who are the leaders whom you can influence just before the meeting starts.

If you can get the chairman himself, or the guest of honor to go up from \$5,000 to \$7,000, or to \$10,000, or to make an enormous increase in his emergency gift, then you have set the ball rolling and the whole group then will begin to give. And these are the things that I have found a speaker can do.

I think that when Arthur sends out all this publicity, and if we ever started believing it, it would be woe to us -- but I think that when we come into these

communities and they write about us in the papers, and we don't try to live up to the responsibility of the job, we don't begin to make them feel that each of us in his own way, the community and we are saving Israel, then we will fail in this campaign, and I don't think we will.

Thank you. (Applause)

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: I am glad I called you up here. I am glad everybody had a chance to hear that. That was really a very full answer to the question I had in mind, and if we all do that, we will all have much better meetings.

I don't want to shut anybody off -- it is getting late; it is quarter to 11.

I saw a few hands. We will take those two, and then call it quits.

MR. IRA FEINBERG: I am one of the speakers from New York City and National. I had some very good suggestions; but I have tried to revise it completely on the basis of what Ruth has said, because she has covered some things.

Essentially what I would like to say is that the function of the speaker really -- and Ruth said this in many ways -- is to maximize, to get the most out of any

meeting in terms of dollars and cents. It doesn't really matter what kind of speech you make and how beautiful it is and how eloquent it is, unless you get the gelt, you get the money, and you double, and possibly triple what was raised the year before.

I would like to go back to the convention that was held here in New York. Two stories impressed me which brought to mind this suggestion which I would like to leave.

One man got up and said he had decided to come to the convention and give \$18,000 because of business conditions. He got to the convention and he spoke to someone, impressed him, he decided to give \$36,000.

Then he heard somebody speak, and he decided to give \$72,000.

This impressed all of us.

The second story was somebody who got up and said, "I heard that person's story about doubling and quadrupling, but I am one of the persons who has been doing this year after year after year."

So I think in your audiences you are going to find people who cannot double.

But I would say that on the whole the majority

of the audience, the people you are speaking to, you can get them in 1959 to double what they gave in 1958 because of this emergency situation.

Last, I don't think that any speaker or anybody working for the United Jewish Appeal has the right, the audacity, the nerve, to ask any member of his audience, to give one penny more than last year unless he, himself, has substantially increased his own pledge. Then you have the right to go to somebody and say, "Look, you have to give twice as much," because you, yourself, have given that way.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: The last question.

A VOICE: I would like to make two very short remarks. I feel that this year, especially those speakers who have come from Israel recently, have to try and impress upon their audiences that just getting the gelt will not be enough -- not if they double or triple the income of 1958 will you get the goals of, Abe Harman spoke of, \$200 million.

Why not as an additional stunt, or gimmick, or whichever you prefer to call this, get up at the end of the meeting, after the fund-raising was done already, and ask each and everyone of the contributors to become a worker

in the sense of getting at least one additional contributor this year that was not on the list a year before.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: Good point.

A VOICE: Or else, they will not have done their duty to the 1959 campaign. This is one point.

The second one:

An additional reflection of what Mr. Sagi said. Speakers should not come to communities only a few hours earlier, but should stay a few hours later after a certain contact has already been achieved, after they have received a certain trust, and then they can elaborate on abolishing the suspicion which does exist among some of the people I have met during the speeches, of this being just another gimmick, and the story repeating itself each year with new gimmicks, or made up stories or emergencies or urgencies.

If the speaker stays until the meeting is over, and then speaks to the few people that are interested, he can then get better results even inasmuch as straightening out the sharing of responsibility with world Jewry and Israel as to tackling the problem.

CHAIRMAN FRIEDMAN: These post-meeting bull sessions are very valuable, because what they do do is

keep the door open for a return visit where you are then well known already and more welcome.

Let me thank you all for these suggestions, and let me say that though our ranks are thinned a bit by the lateness of the hour, it simply means that there are more refreshments available for those here. And I should like to invite you all to adjourn to the right and to the left to the tables.

(Whereupon at 10:50 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.)

* * *