Israel

The period under review (July, 1950, through June, 1951) was marked in Israel by severe external and internal strains and by an unceasing search for new resources and new methods to meet the huge tasks facing the young state. The rapid immigration of Jews without means or skills continued unabated, presenting perhaps the most important single problem Israel had to contend with.

The Korean war, the intensification of the cold war between the Communist and non-Communist powers, and the resulting rearmament made it difficult for Israel to obtain urgently needed materials and forced her to pay very high prices for those she did obtain.

Israel's gradual taking of a pro-Western position brought about a deepening of the rift between the pro-Western majority and the pro-Soviet minority within Israel's powerful Labor movement.

The population was growing weary of the regime of austerity and privation, and increasingly critical of the principles, and, still more, of the methods, by which Israel was governed. The internal tension was evidenced in the "crisis of confidence" and "businessmen's revolt" of August, 1950; in the intensified drive against the black market of September and October; in the cabinet crisis of October; in the increased strength shown by the General Zionists in the municipal elections of November; in the renewed cabinet crisis of March, 1951; and lastly, in the decision to dissolve the Knesset and hold elections on July 30, 1951.

To find a long range solution for the country's problems, the national leadership sought to obtain new resources abroad: through a bond drive, grants-in-aid, the American United Jewish Appeal, and encouragement of private investments. The government sought to answer the mounting criticism by devising means for increasing productivity and making the best use of the available machinery through the utilization of the foreign loans.

Despite the strains progress was made in every field. The year was marked not only by a remarkable growth of population through immigration, but also by the construction of new roads, houses, and factories; the founding of new settlements and towns; the planting of new groves; the development of new skills, machines, and methods; and in some areas by the introduction of new amenities and conveniences. In July, 1950, however, it still looked as though progress, though spectacular, had not kept pace with the country's needs.

In the background loomed the shadow of a third world war, which spurred
on Israel in its efforts to bring in Jews from abroad, especially those Jews living in countries where any upheaval might bring about a universal slaughter. Israel also needed a larger population so as to defend itself against a possible attack by the Arab countries.

**Military Developments**

Nowhere was progress so marked as in the military. From the raggle-taggle partisans of the Haganah, the Army for the Defense of Israel (*Tzva Ha-haganah le-Israel*) had, within three years, grown into one of the two best military forces in the Middle East (the other being the Turkish Army). Loyalty to the democratic state was stressed in the army and party politics were played down.

In July, 1950, the navy held extensive maneuvers for the first time in the eastern Mediterranean, going as far as the Turkish coast. More than 75,000 men and women—or 95.2 per cent of the regular reserves—participated in the eight-day autumn maneuvers ending on October 22, 1950. These were the first large-scale maneuvers of Israel’s armed forces.

The law for the mobilization of women, introduced in the Knesset in February, 1951, and the allegedly inadequate supply of kosher food in the army, were the only bones of contention in the sphere of national defense.

On February 19, 1951, General Sir Brian Robertson, Commander of the British Middle East Land Forces, visited Israel in the course of a tour of the Middle East. Robertson was said to have found only three countries capable of co-operating with the West in the defense of that area: Turkey, Jordan, and Israel.

**Political Developments**

The causes of the political crisis which occurred during the period under review were, first, sharp differences of opinion over economic questions; popular impatience with the inexperienced, often inept, and occasionally overbearing officialdom; and, lastly, disagreement as to the place of religion in the state. The last factor was the immediate occasion for the cabinet crises of October, 1950, and March, 1951, which led to the dissolution of the Knesset.

**Cabinet Crisis**

Late in July, 1950, Dov Joseph, Minister of Rationing and Supply, suddenly announced that clothing and footwear would be strictly rationed owing to shortages. The public, until then grudgingly co-operative, revolted. Consumers began stocking goods and merchants rebelled. A thriving black market arose.

The government countered by a campaign of arrests, appeals to the people, and by promulgating regulations which it had neither the organization nor the experience to enforce.

In the midst of the confusion the Religious Bloc charged that religious
parents in the immigrant camps were being discriminated against and demanded more concessions to religious sentiment. Then on October 15, 1950, Prime Minister Ben Gurion handed in his resignation.

The quarrel was patched up largely at the instance of Ben Gurion's own party, which had no desire to hold general elections at a time when its regime was so unpopular.

In November the cabinet was reorganized with a view to placating the critics of the government's economic policy and administration. Jacob Geri, a non-partisan business executive, was made Minister of Commerce and Industry; Pinhas Lavon, Secretary General of the Labor Federation, was made Minister of Agriculture; the Ministry of Rationing and Supply was dissolved and its functions were assigned to the Ministry of Agriculture. Dov Joseph was made Minister of Communications. The situation with regard to religious education remained virtually unchanged.

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

The country-wide municipal elections held on November 14, 1950, tended to vindicate the General Zionists' claim to increased strength: they captured 25.2 per cent of the vote in the municipal elections (they had won 5.3 per cent in 1949 elections to the first Knesset), while Mapai got 26.9 per cent (as compared with 36 per cent in the Knesset). Of the three largest cities, Tel Aviv retained its General Zionist mayor; in Haifa, despite the rise in the General Zionist vote, a Laborite mayor succeeded the incumbent General Zionist; and in Jerusalem the General Zionist councillors helped to put in a Labor Religious mayor to succeed the incumbent General Zionist (who had turned Progressive). In Petach Tikvah, a General Zionist stronghold, the mayor, after ten years in office, lost to a Laborite.

CABINET CRISIS OVER RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

In February and March, 1951, a new dispute developed with the Religious Bloc over the education of Yemenite children in the transit camps. The Bloc claimed that the arrangements made for immigrant camps applied to the transit camps as well. Israel was left without a legal government after Ben Gurion failed to get a vote of confidence on his educational policy and no other man could be found to form another cabinet. However, the old cabinet carried on as a caretaker government until the national elections, which were set for July 30, 1951.

A serious constitutional question arose with the introduction by the caretaker government of controversial legislation. Two bills were introduced between February and May which antagonized the Orthodox Jews: one abolishing the much abused exemption of Orthodox women from military service; and another declaring the absolute equality of women with men before the law, which also applied to the religious courts adjudicating questions of marriage, divorce, inheritance, etc. Shortly before the Knesset was prorogued, Ben Gurion worked out a compromise with Religious Labor members. The final draft of the Women's Equal Rights Bill, adopted on June 17, 1951 by the legislature, had their approval; Agudath Israel voted against the bill, and Mapam abstained.
During the debate on the mobilization of women, police arrested a group of young zealots on the charge of plotting to bomb the Knesset. The government was accused of invoking the special emergency regulations which had been used by the British in 1945 to suppress Jewish resistance. On May 22, 1951, the outgoing legislature condemned the Defense Regulations of 1945 and directed the legal committee of the Knesset to draft a substitute code.

The most important law passed by the outgoing Knesset was the Nationality Act of July 1950. This affirmed the right of every Jew to immigrate to Israel and defined the citizenship status of present and future inhabitants. The law contained a provision permitting an Israel citizen to retain his previous nationality. However, under United States law, Americans becoming Israelis lost their American citizenship if they participated in Israel elections, took an oath of allegiance to Israel, or served in its army.

As a result of the political crisis, the Religious Bloc, consisting of Mizrahi, Labor Mizrachi, Agudat Israel, and Labor Agudat Israel, broke up. Religious Labor (Hapoel Hamizrachi) was by far the strongest of the four groups of the Bloc. Before the elections of 1951 a degree of rapprochement between Mapai and Religious Labor was effected.

The General Zionist party attracted most of the unaffiliated critics of the government. Herut broke up when two of its leading members in the Knesset, Hillel Kook (Peter Bergson) and Eri Jabotinsky, left the party. The Fighters (formerly the Stern Group), which had one member in the first Knesset, offered no candidate for the second.

Mapam, or the United Workers party, veered further and further toward the Soviet Union in its orientation. This resulted in the break-up of several kibbutzim of mixed political membership, threatened to split the Kibbutz Meuhad, the largest of the three kibbutz federations, and also threatened to split the Histadruth, where Mapam was an influential minority.

The national elections of July 30, 1951, returned Mapai to the same leading position which it had had before, but without a majority. The General Zionists moved up to second place. Mapam, Herut, Mizrachi, and Agudat Israel lost votes; Religious Labor made some gains. The elections were a valuable educational process—about a third of the estimated 850,000 voters had never before exercised the right to vote as free citizens in a democratic country.

**Foreign Affairs**

Israel during the period under review drew closer to the West and to some non-Arab countries in Asia, but her relations with her Arab neighbors remained unchanged.

On July 4, 1950, a tense and crowded Knesset, after hours of debate, by a vote of 68 to 20 approved the government's position on Korea. A Mapam resolution expressing lack of confidence in the government was defeated by 79 to 19.

Subsequently on July 11, 1950, in an address before 1,000 students of the University, Foreign Minister Sharett said: "Of the two conflicting conceptions
of the social order now locked in ideological struggle—the democratic and the
communistic—Israel has definitely chosen the former." He added that while
Israel was anxious to promote friendly relations with all nations regardless of
their internal regime, she could not ignore the fact that only in democratic
countries did Jewish communities enjoy freedom of organization and action.

On January 24, 1951, Sharett told the Knesset that there was no truth in
the rumors that acceptance by Israel of Point Four aid from the United
States involved payment of a "political price."

A week later, Israel at Lake Success voted in favor of the United States-
sponsored resolution to charge Communist China with an act of aggression in
Korea. The Knesset, by a vote of 56 to 29, with 6 absentions, approved the
government's foreign policy and its negotiations with the United States for
Point Four aid.

Anxious as Israel was to establish friendly relations with the Asiatic coun-
tries, she was able to do so only with Turkey. Co-operation between Israel
and Turkey grew, both in the economic and political spheres, following the
appointment of Seyfulla Esin as the first Turkish minister to Israel; he pre-
sented his credentials to President Weizmann on June 3, 1950. Although
India recognized Israel on September 18, 1950, there was still no Indian rep-
resentative in Israel at the time of writing (August, 1951).

Iran, another non-Arab Moslem country, after having accorded Israel de
facto recognition, closed her consulate in July, 1951, under pressure of the
Arab states, whose help she was seeking in her contest with the British oil com-
pany in Iran.

Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Iceland granted Israel de jure recognition
in June and July, 1950. Israel sent to Scandinavia one of her leading figures,
Abraham Katzenelson (who upon assuming his post Hebraized his name to
Nissan).

RELATIONS WITH GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES

There was a marked improvement in Israel's relations with Great Britain.
Ernest Bevin was still foreign secretary when the year began; his insistence
on shipping arms to Egypt represented his old policy of hostility to Israel.
But other influences soon began to make themselves felt. When on July 30,
1951, Herbert Morrison, Bevin's successor as foreign secretary, in a speech in
the Commons urged the Arab countries to realize that the state of Israel had
come to stay, British-Israel relations seemed to have improved very much in-
deed. In the same speech Morrison condemned Egypt for barring the passage
of Israel-bound ships through the Suez Canal.

In the middle of January, 1951, David Horowitz of the Israel Treasury
signed an agreement in London for the release of the entire sterling balance
owed Israel by Britain, and for the transfer to Israel of philanthropic funds
raised in England.

On December 13, 1950, James G. McDonald left Israel upon the termination
of his duties as United States Ambassador. His successor, Monnett Bain Davis,
unlike McDonald a career diplomat, presented his credentials to President
Chaim Weizmann at Rehovoth on March 4, 1951. Four hours later, Davis and
Sharett placed their signatures on an agreement providing for a loan of
$100,000 to Israel. This sum was to be expended before June 30, 1951, on securing American technical assistance in road and railroad construction, irrigation, the organization of public health services, etc. Israel was to send people to the United States for training in deep-sea fishing, railway operation, manufacture of ceramics and ship repair work.

Despite the improved relations with England and continued good relations with the United States, Israel was not always sure of the support of these nations in its conflicts with the Arab states. In the Huleh area dispute, both countries took the initiative in getting the United Nations to condemn Israel, and hints were repeatedly thrown out that Israel must make concessions in the questions of boundaries and Arab refugees.

There was no appreciable improvement in Israel's relations with her Arab neighbors. The assassination, on July 13, 1951, of King Abdullah of Jordan removed from the scene the one Arab ruler who was definitely committed to making peace with Israel.

RELATIONS WITH GERMANY

While Israel sought unsuccessfully to make peace with her Arab neighbors, she refused to join the Western powers in making peace with Germany.

A high Israel official spent several weeks in Germany in the summer of 1950 studying the various aspects of Israel's claims against Germany. These claims were for war reparations, the German property of Israel citizens, and the heirless property of deceased Jews.

On September 27, 1950, Sharett, in his opening address before the United Nations General Assembly at Flushing Meadows, bitterly attacked the "appeasement of Germany" and the readmission of that nation, with "her guilt unexpiated and her heart unchanged," into the family of nations.

On March 13, 1951, Sharett read to the Knesset the text of Israel's note on reparations to the four powers occupying Germany; the note assessed the financial and economic losses suffered by the Jewish people at the hands of the Nazis at six billion dollars, and asked for one and a half billion as a minimum.

A week or so thereafter Sharett handed Ambassador Davis and the British minister, Knox Helm, a note describing the plight of Iraqi Jewry and emphasizing the danger with which the situation was fraught. Just before this, speaking in the Knesset, Sharett declared that Israel would deduct the value of Jewish property seized by Iraq from the sums she had agreed to pay in compensation for property abandoned by Arabs in Israel.

Early in July, 1951, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs took diplomatic steps in the matter of the expulsion of a large number of Hungarian Jews from their homes in Budapest.

Economic Life

Israel's chief problem was an economic one. How could a relatively poor country sustain a rapidly growing population, and how was the country's wealth to be distributed among its inhabitants?
The government of Israel was determined to maintain the policy of unrestricted immigration, especially from countries where persecution threatened. The government was also determined to insure maximum employment, a relatively high standard of living, and as equal a distribution of goods and services as was possible. On the last score, the government had less support from the population than on the others. Nevertheless, in the national elections of July 30, 1951, 75 per cent of the electorate voted for such a policy. Only about 25 per cent of the people voted for parties pledged to the reduction of Labor's power or opposed to the principles of the welfare state.

While most of the people of Israel approved of the government's goals, few were enthusiastic about the manner in which they were being attained, and few gave the government their wholehearted support.

Twice within the period under review the minority opposed to the government's economic policy gave open expression to its resentment. Early in August, 1950, the shopkeepers, incensed by the sudden imposition of clothes rationing, closed their places of business. And in November the private orange growers refused to pick their crop until the government granted them higher export subsidies. The increased political activity of the middle class, manifested in the municipal and national elections, was part of the same revolt.

In spite of much talk and preachment about the need for raising productivity and in spite of such concrete steps as the sending of workers' delegations to America and other countries and the attempt to form joint management-labor production boards, the average productivity of the Israel worker remained low while his wages continued relatively high.

By July, 1950, the Prime Minister's office had ready a four-year plan which envisaged an annual immigration of 200,000 for the period; a rising standard of living based on a rationalized industry; and an agricultural population of 20 per cent. The cost of the plan was estimated at one and a half billion dollars, of which one-third was to be raised by the citizens of Israel, and the rest in the form of loans, investments, and gifts from the Jews of the world, and by grants and loans from the United States.

AGRICULTURE AND FISHING

Three million dunam of land (750,000 acres) were under cultivation by the end of the year, as compared with 2,388,000 dunam in the year 1949-50; 44,000 tons of wheat and rye were produced, as compared with 26,000 in the previous year; 215,000 tons of vegetables, as compared with 130,000.

The above official estimates do not tell the whole story. Many new agricultural settlements were founded in various parts of the country, including the Negev and the Arabah, where nothing had been grown for centuries. Barley was sown in the northern Negev, watermelons were raised on farms near Elath. Numerous little "auxiliary farms"—with truck gardens, dairy cattle, and home-grown fodder—were established all over the country. New immigrants could work at road construction, in industries, or at the building trades while growing food for their own use or for the market. Agricultural instructors, some in the regular employ of the government, others working part time or on a voluntary basis, went from settlement to settlement and
farm to farm teaching the newcomers how to plant, what to plant, the operation of agricultural machinery, etc.

New fishing vessels were bought and 200 Italian fishermen brought in as part of the development of the infant industry of deep-sea fishing. Israel boats fished in the Mediterranean, Red Sea, and even in the North Sea.

Apart from Elath on the Red Sea, which was expected to develop into an important port, several fishing ports along the Mediterranean were to be constructed north and south of Tel Aviv. The largest of them was Caesarea, between Tel Aviv and Haifa.

The ambitious plans of the Ministry of Agriculture aimed at the production of enough vegetables, eggs and dairy products—and later on fish, poultry, and mutton—to satisfy domestic needs. While the cultivation of cereal was increased, it was not expected that Israel would in the near future produce enough bread for her own needs; at least 50 per cent of her grain would have to be imported. There was even less likelihood of satisfying the home demand for beef.

The production of eggs, pond-bred fish, and dairy products was adversely affected by a lack of foreign currency with which to import feed. Israel’s staple export item, citrus fruit, which earned the country its largest amount of foreign currency, did not fare too well in the period under review. Much was done in the way of introducing modern machinery (bought with funds provided by the American loan) into the production of citrus fruit, but only beginnings were made in the rehabilitation of old groves ruined during the war and in the planting of new ones. New groves took years before they bore fruit. On top of that, Spain entered Israel’s chief market, Great Britain, as a serious competitor in the sale of citrus fruit.

At the height of the season (December 10, 1950), the orange growers declared a strike. The strike was settled a month later, and the growers did not fare as poorly as they had feared, but the government decided to increase the acreage of citrus groves planted by collective and co-operative settlements.

In January, 1951, the Agricultural Bank of Israel was finally established, in accordance with an act passed by the Knesset the year before. The Board of Directors which was responsible to the cabinet, consisted of representatives of the Ministries of Agriculture and Finance, of the Jewish Agency, Histadruth, the private agriculturists, and the kibbutzim. The government held 76 per cent of the shares.

In the same month the Export-Import Bank of the United States approved a second loan of $35,000,000 for the development of Israel’s agriculture. (In 1949, $35,000,000 had been allotted for agriculture as part of a loan for $110,000,000 by the Bank to Israel.)

The drainage of the Huleh marshes, begun in March, 1951, was perhaps the largest single work of construction so far undertaken by Israel. This promised to reclaim large tracts of fertile soil (some 12,500 acres) for cultivation.

More trees were planted and irrigation pipes laid in Israel during the period under review than in any other preceding decade. In the middle of May, 1951, at a desert spot twenty miles northwest of Beersheba, Israel’s larg-
est subterranean pumping station was opened, the first of four to provide water for irrigating the whole of the northern Negev.

INDUSTRY

Much progress was made in establishing industries outside the hitherto chief industrial regions (Tel Aviv—Ramath Gan and Haifa Bay). An American-organized shoe factory was constructed near Jerusalem, which was also the site for a proposed pencil factory. Hadera (halfway between Haifa and Tel Aviv), Beersheba and Migdal Gad in the south, and other places were becoming industrial areas.

Haifa made the greatest progress in industrial growth. Its largest new concern, the Kaiser-Frazer assembly plant, was opened in June, 1951. In September, 1950, the Haifa refineries resumed operations at 25 per cent of their capacity, producing for local needs only.

New refrigerator assembly plants were opened in Tel Aviv and Haifa; a watch factory in Haifa; canneries by the shores of Lake Kinnereth and Haifa Bay; a tire manufacturing plant in Tel Aviv; and a paper factory in Acre. This is by no means an exhaustive list of the new industries which were established.

The progress made by Israel's young merchant marine (much of it was government-controlled) was remarkable. El Al, Israel's government-owned airline, also expanded its operations. On May 1, 1951, El Al began to send flights direct from Lydda to New York.

The long-established Palestine Potash Company which exploited the rich deposits in the Dead Sea was still idle. The division of the area between Israel and Jordan and the destruction wrought by the war necessitated the building of a new road and installations, and the raising of new capital with which to resume work.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Several important trade agreements were concluded or renewed. An agreement with Holland, signed in September, 1950, provided for the purchase by Israel of £2,000,000 of goods within one year, payment to be made partly in the farm exports to the Netherlands, partly by the transfer of guilder assets held by Israelis, and the rest in foreign currency. The agreement was renewed in August, 1951.

Trade agreements were concluded with Bulgaria, Italy, France, Finland (November, 1950), Denmark (December, 1950), and Yugoslavia (January, 1951). Most important was the trade agreement with Turkey (signed at Ankara on June 5, 1950), the only country in the Middle East to trade extensively with Israel.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT AND BANKING

Definite progress during the year was made in stimulating private investment. An Investment Center was set up in April, 1950, as a clearing agency for various government departments dealing with prospective foreign investors.

On May 1, 1951, the Anglo-Palestine Bank transferred its headquarters
from London to Tel Aviv and was renamed the Israel National Bank (Bank Leumi Le-Israel). Founded by the Zionist movement to foster colonization in Palestine and incorporated in England in 1902, the Bank served as sole financial agent for the Israel government after the establishment of the Jewish state. It established a special department to issue and administer Israel’s currency, as well as a department to administer government loans.

Immigration

The immigration of Iraqi Jews into Israel began before 1951. But when sweeping measures were taken by Iraq against her Jews, “Operation Ali Baba” was organized and the bulk of the Iraqi Jews were flown in during March, April, and May of 1951.

Other ancient Oriental Jewish communities were evacuated to Israel during the year: cave-dwelling Jews from the Libyan desert, and Bedouin-like Jews from Hadhramaut, east Aden.

Next to the immigration of Jews from Iraq, the largest was that of Rumanian Jews who arrived in Haifa aboard the Transylvania at a rate of more than a thousand a month. Immigration continued from Poland, and at a lesser rate from Hungary and other Danubian countries behind the Iron Curtain.

There was continued immigration from North Africa in fairly substantial numbers, and an accelerated immigration of Jews from Iran.

In Israel reception camps were overcrowded, staffs overworked, and immigrants unoccupied and full of complaints. Sheer necessity (the shortage of funds) finally compelled the government and Jewish Agency, in July, 1950, to require all able-bodied immigrants to work. The work consisted of such things as the planting of trees, construction of roads and terraces, and plowing and sowing of fields; a minimum wage was paid. In addition, new and cheaper shelters were improvised to house the immigrants.

Progress was made in absorbing the immigrants culturally. Special classes (or ulpanim) were organized all over the country to teach educated immigrants enough Hebrew to enable them to practice their professions. Special publications in simple Hebrew were issued; plans were drawn for the publication of a Hebrew daily for immigrants.

Israel’s cultural policy toward the immigrants was indirectly set forth by Prime Minister Ben Gurion during a debate in the Knesset in February, 1951, when he said: “I want the Yemenite Jews to become officers in the army and government officials. I want the Yemenite Jew to forget as quickly as possible that he was a Yemenite, just as I have forgotten that I was a Polish Jew.”

The number and circulation of publications in languages other than Hebrew grew considerably. Yiddish was still the most important of the foreign languages used by the immigrants. Mildly repressive measures at the administrative level had so far prevented the publication of a Yiddish daily or the establishment of a Yiddish theater. In July, 1950, a Yiddish troupe in Jaffa,
after defying police orders to disband, brought its case before the Supreme Court. The latter ruled that, as there was no law against the establishment of a permanent Yiddish theater, the action of the police was illegal.

Education

From the Jewish National Council of Palestine (Vaad Leumi) the government inherited three school systems, each with its own ideology (General, Labor, and Religious), as well as the religious schools managed by Agudath Israel and by the ultra-Orthodox. Bitter disputes took place between the government and religious parties over the question of which schools the children were to attend, especially in the case of the children of Oriental immigrants living in camps. At a time when the school population was growing at a phenomenal rate and a critical shortage of teachers and a still more critical shortage of school buildings existed, the government had to put in force the recently enacted law of public education providing for free, universal, and compulsory schooling between the ages of six and thirteen.

In January, 1951, when the educational budget came up for consideration by the Knesset, the Research Department of the Ministry of Education reported the following: The number of students in Israel's 2,500 educational institutions totaled 260,000. This represented an increase of 44,000 over the previous year. The number of teachers was 11,000, as compared with the 6,300 of two years before. This increase was the result of the large influx of immigrants and the compulsory education law.

The number of elementary schools had more than doubled. In the kindergartens (which in Israel played an important part in inculcating the Hebrew language) the number of children increased by 40 per cent and the number of classes by 25 per cent. There was a 19 per cent rise in the number of secondary schools (including agricultural schools), while the number of students increased by 24 per cent. Attendance at kindergartens and secondary schools was not compulsory; high schools charged tuition fees.

There were 23 per cent more training schools for teachers than in the period 1949–50, but the number of students had decreased by one per cent (because of the large number that had to be assigned to classes before the completion of their training). Fully one-third of the teachers in Israel were recent arrivals. Of these, nearly half came from the generally backward Jewish communities of Yemen, North Africa, Iraq, and other Eastern countries.

Parents could send their children to one of four main types of schools: General (35 per cent of the pupils in the country); Labor (37 per cent); Religious or Mizrachi (18 per cent); Orthodox or Agudath Israel (6 per cent); and others. Except for a few extreme Orthodox schools, all had adopted a basic and uniform curriculum which included not only languages and the sciences, but also handicrafts, gardening, and agriculture. There was a uniform administration for all schools, and all appointments were made by the government and local municipalities on the recommendation of recognized representatives of the different organizations.
ADULT EDUCATION

To alleviate the shortage of teachers and at the same time to accelerate the integration of new immigrants into the life of the country, a school for training adult education teachers was opened at the Hebrew University at the initiative of Martin Buber. This school was under the joint supervision of the Ministry of Education, Jewish Agency and the University. It offered a ten-month course, with special emphasis on Jewish studies, pedagogy, political science, the geography of Israel, and Israel life and problems.

Graduates of the school taught the ordinary immigrants and their children. Hebrew courses for adults were conducted in every locality where there were immigrants. Some adult evening courses were conducted by voluntary organizations.

UNIVERSITIES

The University opened its academic year with a record registration of 2,000, as compared with the 1,750 of the previous year and 900 in 1948-49. The staff grew from 219 in 1949-50 to 290 in 1950-51. Unable to use the regular university building on Mount Scopus, which is in Arab territory, classes met in twenty buildings scattered about Jerusalem.

The Hebrew Institute of Technology in Haifa also had a record registration: 900 students in the Technion proper, 400 in the junior high school, and 300 in the evening courses. Yaakov Dori, former Chief of Staff of the Army, was elected president. The Institute planned to move from its present location in the heart of the city to a new site south of Haifa.

Cultural Life

Israel's cultural problems were sharpened by the large influx of immigrants and by the cutting off of her native youth from the historic sources of Jewish culture in the Diaspora. Concern was felt over the lowering of the general cultural level of the country caused by the influx of so many illiterates. There was also concern over the narrow cultural horizon of the native-born sabras, who, unlike their parents, were children of a frontier country lacking deep cultural roots or traditions.

The older generation of writers debated the question whether there had not been something amiss in the manner in which they had handed down the Jewish spiritual heritage to their children. A short book by A. Kariv, entitled Adabrah ve-yirvah li ("Getting It off My Chest"), re-examined the writings of the Hebrew writers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century who shaped the thinking of Israel's youth about Jews and Jewish life in Europe. He found that these writings, which were produced during a period of revolt against the old forms, gave a distorted and unfair picture of the Jewish people, with the result that native Israelis came to look upon them with disdain, even while ready to risk their lives to bring them to Israel. Kariv was not the only one to speak so.

It was natural that with the destruction of East European Jewry there
should come books of nostalgic reminiscence. The most important of these was Zalman Shazar’s *Kokhve-Boker* (“Stars of the Morning”). Shazar, until October, 1950 minister of education, came from a hasidic family in White Russia, and was a Socialist Zionist leader.

Great interest was shown in the history of the Zionist movement. Among the books published were Ben Gurion’s *Behilahem Israel* (“Israel Embattled”), Menachem Beigin’s *Hamered* (“The Revolt”); several volumes on the history of various fighting units, Moshe Smilansky’s third volume *Mishpahat Ha-adama* (“Family of the Earth”) on the early settlers of the late nineteenth century; a collection of essays on Zionist questions *Hazon Vehagshamah* (“Vision and Fulfillment”) by the late Shlomo Kaplansky, which he prepared for publication shortly before his death in December, 1950; and books by the late Rabbi Meir Bar-Ilan (Berlin), leader of the Mizrachi, (*Kitve R. Meir Bar-Ilan*); by Yitzhak Gruenbaum, veteran Zionist leader, *Hatnuah Hatzionit behitpathutah*, Vol. III (“Evolution of the Zionist Movement”), and a collection of quotations from the writings of Berl Katzenelson.

During the period under review appeared the second and third volumes of the Hebrew Encyclopedia (*Ha Encyclopedia HaIvrit*); Volume Eleven of Ben-Yehuda’s *Hebrew Lexicon*, an important Talmud concordance; the final volume of Joseph Klausner’s “History of the Second Jewish Commonwealth”; several works of scholarship on medieval Hebrew literature; Nathan Rotenstreich’s “Jewish Thought in the Modern World,” the first volume of a Biblical encyclopedia, and other works of Judaica.

A. J. Agnon of Jerusalem was again awarded the Bialik Prize, for his new collection of short stories. Yehuda Yaari published the first volume of a trilogy *Shoresh ale Mayim* (“A Root upon the Waters”). An important war novel appeared—“Midnight Echelon,” by S. Yizhar (Yizhar Smilansky). Joshua Bar-Joseph, a fifth generation Israeli who depicts the life of the old religious communities recently finished his trilogy, “The Enchanted City,” which was four years in the writing.

There were a great many translations published in the period under review from Aristophanes to Somerset Maugham. Of particular interest was a volume of Walt Whitman’s poetry translated by Simon Halkin.

Israel’s periodicals ranged from Mapam’s doctrinaire and pro-Soviet *Orlogin* (“Timepiece”), in which Stalin’s latest philological or biological pronouncement was somehow given a “Zionist interpretation,” to the ardently free-enterprise *Hamaarav* (“The West”), edited by Wolfgang von Weisel. But it was the daily Hebrew press which exerted the strongest influence on the public. Most dailies also had a week-end edition containing a literary supplement; these supplements were read more widely than the literary journals.

**THEATER**

The theater had an active year. A most important feature of the period under review was the emphasis laid on plays of local and current interest. *Kra li Siomka* (“Call Me Siomka”), by Nathan Shaham, portrayed the moral decline which affected certain sections of the dominant party; it showed younger officials ruthlessly exploiting the idealism of the true pioneers. *Bet
Hillel ("Hillel's House"), by Moshe Shamir, put on by the Habimah Theater, dealt with some of the problems facing the kibbutzim as a result of the influx of immigrants. The satirical theater Matate ("Broom") reflected Israel's keen interest in the workings of its political democracy by putting on a good-humored play entitled Hatzebiu bead Agassi ("Vote for Agassi").

There were some performances of plays based on Jewish history, as for example Hazaz's Beketz Hayamim ("The End of Days"). Most plays were translations from other languages. Ohel, the labor theater, however, presented The Mad Woman of Chaillot by Jean Giradoux, and Habimah staged Shakespeare's Othello and Arthur Miller's Death of a Salesman. The Chamber Theater gave Noel Coward's Blithe Spirit, Molière's Tartuffe, Maupassant's The Wayside Inn, Sean O'Casey's Juno and the Paycock, and Ibsen's Enemy of the People. Israel's five theaters were all in Tel Aviv, but from time to time they toured the other localities.

**MUSIC AND ART**

The Hebrew National Opera, founded in 1948, presented La Boheme, Faust, Manon, and other operas in Hebrew. But the most important musical event of Israel during the past year was the American tour of the Israel Philharmonic Orchestra, arranged by the American Fund for Israel Institutions. Its conductor during the tour was Serge Koussevitsky.

Another important event was the Bach festival at Ein Gev, a kibbutz on the Sea of Galilee. It was Koussevitsky's hope to make the Ein Gev festival Israel's counterpart of the Tanglewood festival in the United States.

In October, 1950, Marcel Janco of Tel Aviv exhibited paintings on Israel themes in New York. In June, 1951 Marc Chagall came from New York to Tel Aviv to arrange an extensive exhibition of his work; in Tel Aviv he announced his decision to settle in Israel. The Chagall exhibition was the first undertaking of the new association of Israel museums and was opened by Acting Premier Moshe Sharett (during Ben Gurion's absence in America) on May 30, 1951. It consisted of sixty oils, more than a hundred gouaches and water colors, sketches for the theater and opera, and a number of recent pottery pieces. Chagall's latest painting, King David, was exhibited for the first time in the Tel Aviv Museum.

Another important exhibition at the Tel Aviv Municipal Museum was that of new works by Reuven Rubin, the best known of Israel's artists and since 1912 a strong influence on the development of the country's art.

With the co-operation of the Israel government and the municipality of Safad, a Tel Aviv publisher established an art museum named after the late sculptor Enrico Glicenstein. Some of Glicenstein's best known works, such as his sculptures of Moses and Beethoven, were to become a part of the permanent collection of the museum.

**ARCHAEOLOGY**

During the period under review, important new discoveries were made in Israel of ancient synagogues and cities. At Shaar Hagolan, a kibbutz in the Jordan Valley, Dr. Moshe Stekelis of the Hebrew University found the first known evidence of a Stone Age civilization having existed in Palestine some
sixty-five centuries before the Common Era. He unearthed utensils and art objects, including a feminine figurine known as the “Venus of Shaar Hagolan.” The remains of an ancient village were found on the land of the kibbutz.

North of Tel Aviv, on the banks of the Yarkon, a hill called Tel Qasile was excavated under the direction of Dr. Benjamin Masiler of the Hebrew University. Evidence of the Philistine, Israelite, Roman, Byzantine, and Mameluke periods was found. In Yafia, near Nazareth, Professor Sukenik of the Hebrew University found remains of an ancient synagogue.

M. Z. Frank

JEWISH IMMIGRATION TO ISRAEL

DURING the year under review (July, 1950 through June, 1951) immigration to Israel continued on a vast scale, both in terms of numbers and of the complete Jewish communities that were affected. Nevertheless, despite the size and scope of the immigration, there was reason to believe that it had not realized all of its theoretical potentialities. For two practical factors limited the extent of immigration to Israel: first, the difficulties Jews encountered in securing permission to leave certain countries; and, second, the insufficient aid given to the Jewish Agency and the State of Israel to assure the assimilation of masses of emigrants into the economic life of Israel.

Immigration Since the Establishment of State of Israel

During the course of the period under review, which was almost identical with the third year of the existence of the state of Israel, 225,113 Jewish immigrants entered Israel, a figure almost equal to that of the peak year in the history of Jewish immigration to Israel. (During the calendar year 1949, 239,076 Jewish immigrants entered the country).

From the time of the establishment of the Jewish state (May 15, 1948) to the end of June, 1951, a total of 638,597 Jewish immigrants entered Israel. Thus, during this period of thirty-seven and one-half months more immigrants (approximately 25 per cent) entered Israel than had entered during the thirty years of the British mandate. As a result, the Jewish population of Israel almost doubled through immigration alone since the establishment of the state (at the time of the Declaration of Independence for Israel there were 665,000 Jews in the country); this growth was exclusive of the natural increase, which, if included, brings the population growth to more than 100 per cent.

On June 30, 1951, the state of Israel numbered approximately 1,500,000 residents, of whom approximately 1,330,000 were Jews and approximately 1

The statistical data presented in this survey are primarily from the Statistical Bulletin of Israel, and in part from the publications of the Aliyah Department of the Jewish Agency.

All totals given as of the end of June, 1951, are provisional, but practically conclusive.
170,000 non-Jews. The non-Jewish population was composed of 70 per cent Moslems, 21 per cent Christians, and 9 per cent Druze.

The average monthly Jewish emigration during the year under review was approximately 19,000, in comparison with approximately 17,000 for the entire period since the founding of the state.

During the year 1950 the number of Jewish immigrants was 169,405, as compared with 239,141 during 1949, and 118,903 during 1948. During the first half of 1951, 128,223 Jewish immigrants came to Israel, as compared with 72,515 during the same period in 1950 and 96,890 during the second half of 1950.

A month-by-month picture of immigration is presented in Table 1. This table shows that Jewish immigration was on the rise during the second part of 1950. It declined at the end of that period, and rose again at the beginning of 1951 to reach its peak in April, 1951, when more than 30,000 immigrants entered Israel.

### TABLE 1

**Jewish Immigration by Month, 1948, 1949, 1950, January-June, 1951**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>1948</th>
<th>1949</th>
<th>1950</th>
<th>1951*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>23,533</td>
<td>13,011</td>
<td>13,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>6,043</td>
<td>24,472</td>
<td>10,928</td>
<td>14,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>2,924</td>
<td>30,747</td>
<td>13,347</td>
<td>21,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>5,499</td>
<td>23,302</td>
<td>8,183</td>
<td>30,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May (1–14)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>23,196</td>
<td>12,666</td>
<td>26,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May (15–31)</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>16,358</td>
<td>14,380</td>
<td>22,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>17,266</td>
<td>16,315</td>
<td>17,968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>8,451</td>
<td>13,947</td>
<td>18,798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>10,786</td>
<td>20,254</td>
<td>16,261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>10,691</td>
<td>19,206</td>
<td>19,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>20,376</td>
<td>13,470</td>
<td>12,018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>27,831</td>
<td>14,341</td>
<td>12,265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>118,993</td>
<td>239,141</td>
<td>169,405</td>
<td>128,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Provisional figures.

### Immigration by Area and Source

During 1950 immigrants entered Israel from sixty-nine countries of which six lay in Eastern Europe, seventeen in Western Europe, sixteen in Asia, nine in Africa, and twenty-one in the American continent and Oceania.

**EASTERN EUROPE**

The principal area of immigration to Israel was Eastern Europe, from which during the course of 1950 more than 76,000 Jews emigrated to Israel, constituting approximately 45 per cent of the total immigration during that year. The proportion of immigration from that area increased from 23 per cent in January, 1950, to 59 per cent in September, 1950; from that point it declined perceptibly. On the average, during the first half of 1950 immigra-
tion from Eastern Europe constituted 36 per cent of the total immigration; during the second half it increased to 51 per cent.

In Eastern Europe—indeed, in the whole world—Rumania was the country that contributed the most immigrants to Israel. During the course of 1950 more than 47,000 Rumanian Jews emigrated to Israel, constituting almost 28 per cent of the total immigration during that year. During the first half of 1951 almost 27,000 immigrants came from Rumania, constituting approximately 20 per cent of the total immigration during those six months. Since the establishment of the state of Israel more than 105,000 Jews had emigrated from Rumania, constituting more than 16 per cent of the total immigration during that period.

Second of the East European countries in terms of immigration to Israel was Poland. Mass emigration from Poland began in December, 1949, by decree of the government of Poland which officially permitted every Jew who renounced his Polish citizenship to emigrate to Israel. During 1950 more than 25,000 Jews emigrated from Poland, constituting approximately 15 per cent of the total immigration during that year. The mass emigration from Poland was halted at the beginning of 1951, and during the course of the first half of 1951 only 1,928 Jewish immigrants came to Israel from Poland. During the period between the establishment of the state of Israel and the end of June, 1951, more than 103,000 Polish Jews emigrated to Israel, from the camps in Germany and Austria, via France, and indirectly from Poland proper. They constituted a little less than 16 per cent of the total immigration during that period.

In prominent contrast to Rumania and Poland was the emigration from Hungary, which was resumed in April, 1950, after a lengthy halt, and was very slight. During 1950, 2,300 Jews immigrated from Hungary, constituting 1.3 per cent of the total immigration during that year. This condition was not improved during the first half of 1951, and at the end of June, 1951, there were still approximately 700 persons in Hungary who had been validated for immigration by the local authorities, as part of the 3,000 immigrants agreed to by the governments of Israel and Hungary.

ASIA

Second in importance in terms of immigration were the countries of Asia (including the Middle East), from which during the course of 1950 more than 54,000 Jews emigrated to Israel, constituting approximately 34.5 per cent of the total immigration during that year. During the first half of 1950 almost 25,000 Jews migrated to Israel from the countries of Asia, while during the second half the number was almost 34,000. However, the proportion of the immigration from this area to that of the total immigration was practically unchanged—34.1 per cent during the first half of 1950, and 34.9 per cent during the second half. This was despite the large increase in emigration from Iraq, which rose from 8,748 persons during the first half of 1950 to 22,879 during the second half, and from Iran, which rose from 4,690 to 7,245. In contrast, the emigration from Yemen declined from 8,111 to 1,092; Operation Magic Carpet was concluded at the end of September, 1950, after having cared for 43,688 immigrants. With this conclusion the number of Jews who
had emigrated from Yemen since 1919 came to 58,254, or a little more than 9 per cent of the total immigration.

The chief country for immigration in Asia and the second in terms of the total immigration during 1950 was Iraq. During the period from the establishment of the state of Israel to May 18, 1950, 7,331 emigrants in all came to Israel from Iraq by different routes.³

In February, 1950, the Iraqi parliament decided to permit the immigration of Jews to Israel on condition that they renounce their status as Iraqi subjects. From that time to the end of June, 1951, 103,162 Jews emigrated from Iraq, via approximately one thousand special flights of Operation Ezra and Nehemiah, representing the largest increase in immigration from one country of origin as of the time of writing. If the 3,500 Iraqi Jews who immigrated to Israel via Iran is included, the number of Iraqi Jews who immigrated during the year ending June, 1951, totaled 106,662 persons. Approximately 15,000 Jews were estimated as remaining in Iraq, most of whom were wealthy.

Immigration from Iran also continued to increase during 1950. While in January 578 persons immigrated to Israel, constituting 4.5 per cent of the total immigration during that month, the number of immigrants from Iran in December was 1,588, constituting 13 per cent of the total immigration during that month. During the course of 1950, 11,985 Jews immigrated to Israel from Iran, including Jews from Kurdistan and Afghanistan. During the first half of 1951, 5,672 Jews immigrated to Israel from Iran and from the time of the establishment of the state of Israel to the end of June, 1951, the number was 20,122.

NORTH AFRICA

The immigration from North Africa—Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco—declined during 1950 to 9,070 persons, of whom 5,410 came during the first half of that year, and 3,660 during the second half. During 1949, 17,924 immigrants came to Israel from North Africa. During the first half of 1951, 6,970 persons came from those countries, while during the period from the establishment of the state to the end of June, 1951, 40,785 North African Jews came to Israel.

The immigration from Libya, which began to increase during the second half of 1949, continued to do so during the first half of 1950, when it averaged approximately 1,900 per month, only to decline to almost 350 per month during the second half of that year. During 1950, 8,818 Jews immigrated to Israel from Libya; during the period between establishment of the state of Israel and the end of 1950 approximately 24,000 Jews immigrated to Israel, constituting 4.7 per cent of the total immigration.

The immigration to Israel from Egypt also declined visibly in comparison with 1949, falling off from 13 per cent of the total immigration to 3.5 per cent, in December of that year. In the course of 1950, 7,154 Jews immigrated to Israel from Egypt; from the time of the establishment of the state of Israel to the end of 1950 the number was 14,422, constituting 2.9 per cent of the total immigration.

³ Data for immigration from Iraq are based on the information of the Aliyah Department of the Jewish Agency.
During the course of 1950, 2,328 Jews immigrated from Turkey, in comparison with more than 26,000 during 1949. From the time of the establishment of the state to the end of 1950 approximately 33,000 Jews immigrated from Turkey, constituting almost 6 per cent of the total immigration.

The immigration to Israel from all the other countries was minimal, constituting approximately 1 per cent of the total immigration. The immigration from Germany and Austria shrank to some score persons per month with the closing of the DP camps. The same was true for Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia with the end of the great wave of immigration that had taken place during the first few months after the establishment of the state of Israel; immigration to Israel from those countries became a trickle during 1950 with the practical liquidation of the Jewish community in those countries.

There was no great change in the extent of immigration from Western Europe, which was a total of 3.3 per cent of the total immigration to Israel during 1950.

A total of 1,800 immigrants came from the American continent during the course of 1950; this number, though small, constituted a considerable relative increase in terms of the whole period from the establishment of the state of Israel to the end of 1950.

COUNTRY OF BIRTH AND PRINCIPAL COUNTRY OF RESIDENCE

Table 2 shows the origins of the immigrants by their country of birth and of principal residence. In Table 2 the distinction between those coming from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Principal Country of Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All countries</td>
<td>169,405</td>
<td>84,347</td>
<td>85,058</td>
<td>169,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>55,066</td>
<td>28,908</td>
<td>26,158</td>
<td>55,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (Asiatic and European)</td>
<td>2,429</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>2,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>32,453</td>
<td>15,096</td>
<td>17,357</td>
<td>32,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>10,519</td>
<td>5,678</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>10,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>8,739</td>
<td>4,604</td>
<td>4,135</td>
<td>8,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>2,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India, Burma, Malaya, Singapore</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR (Asiatic)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>25,820</td>
<td>13,466</td>
<td>12,354</td>
<td>26,013</td>
<td>13,683</td>
<td>12,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>9,189</td>
<td>4,199</td>
<td>4,990</td>
<td>8,905</td>
<td>4,243</td>
<td>4,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>5,022</td>
<td>2,848</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>4,564</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>2,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>1,691</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangier</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>6,766</td>
<td>3,608</td>
<td>3,158</td>
<td>7,416</td>
<td>3,898</td>
<td>3,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td>29,117</td>
<td>14,439</td>
<td>14,678</td>
<td>26,745</td>
<td>13,278</td>
<td>13,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Russia and USSR (n. e. s.) a</td>
<td>2,286</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia, Latvia,</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>13,260</td>
<td>13,239</td>
<td>26,481</td>
<td>13,155</td>
<td>13,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkan Countries</td>
<td>48,002</td>
<td>21,981</td>
<td>26,015</td>
<td>47,850</td>
<td>21,744</td>
<td>26,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>46,178</td>
<td>21,082</td>
<td>25,096</td>
<td>46,166</td>
<td>20,920</td>
<td>25,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and Western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>5,959</td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>5,907</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>3,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>2,693</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Europe</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Europe</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain, Portugal</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico and Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia, New Zealand, etc</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>1,482</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>3,248</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>1,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Not elsewhere specified.

their countries of birth and from their principal countries of residence is prominent. Thus, while 2,286 Jewish immigrants designated the Soviet Union as their country of birth, only 166 designated it as the country of their prin-
principal residence—i.e. those immigrants were indeed born in the Soviet Union but emigrated to Israel from other countries. On the other hand, this table shows that while 1,724 immigrants designated the American continent as the place of their principal residence, only 966 immigrants were born on the American continent. The conclusion is that almost one-half of those who migrated to Israel from the American continent were not natives of American countries.

As for the immigration during the first six months of 1951, at the time of writing only provisional data were available concerning the countries of origin of the immigrants (which were not identical with either the countries of birth or the countries of principal residence).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>80,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumania</td>
<td>26,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries of North Africa</td>
<td>6,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>5,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>5,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>128,223</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composition of the Immigration by Sex**

During 1950 there was a discernible increase in the proportion of females in the total immigration. This proportion was somewhat higher than that of the males: 1,008 females per 1,000 males, as compared with 948 during 1949 and 835 during 1948. This proportion varied according to the country of emigration. For most of the natives of Asia and Africa the number of females was much lower than that of males. For the immigrants from Iran and Iraq the proportion was 857 females per 1,000 males; for the immigrants from Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco, it was 724 females per 1,000 males. On the other hand, the number of females was generally larger than the number of males for immigrants from communities in the process of liquidation: e.g., for the immigrants of Yemen, there were 1,097 females per 1,000 males, and for Libya, there were 1,118 females per 1,000 males.

For immigrants from Europe the number of females was larger than that of males—1,117 females for every 1,000 males. This difference was particularly outstanding in the case of the immigrants from Rumania, where there were 1190 females per 1,000 males.

**Composition by Age**

It is worth noting that the proportion of children among the immigrants did not change during 1950 as compared to 1949. The children in the age
group 0 to 14 in 1950 represented 28.1 per cent of the total immigration; in 1949 it was 28.3 per cent. There was a change in the proportion of the ages 15–29, which declined to 26.0 per cent, as compared with 30.8 per cent in 1949. On the other hand, the proportion of the persons aged 45–59 increased to 16.7 per cent, as compared with 11.8 per cent in 1949. Similarly, the proportion of immigrants 60 years of age and over increased from 6.2 per cent in 1949 to 7.3 per cent in 1950.

**Family Status**

An analysis of the composition of the immigrants during 1950 by family status showed that there was no change in the male group in the proportion of bachelors, married men, widowers and divorcees, as compared with 1949. On the other hand, there were changes in the female group. The number of unmarried women per 1,000 female immigrants 15 years of age and over was 222, in comparison with 189 during 1949; the number of married women declined to 605, as compared to 652 in 1949. The proportion of widows remained high, rising to 162 per 1,000 female immigrants 15 years of age and over, as compared with 151 during 1949.

**Occupation**

As a rule the statistical analyses of the occupations or trades of the immigrants were not as accurate as other information, such as that concerning origin, age, family status, etc. In general, either most of the immigrants did not supply information concerning their occupation, or the information supplied was inadequate and unclear. Hence, it was hard to be certain concerning the composition of the immigration according to the occupations of the immigrants. But one thing was certain: The mass immigration since the establishment of the state was not a selective one, being based on the explicit Law of Redemption that was passed by the first Knesset of Israel that assured every Jew the right to immigrate to the state of Israel. Hence, the vast majority of the immigrants came to Israel lacking any preparation and training to enable them to adjust to the economic needs of the state.

According to the principal statistical data available, of the total number of immigrants during 1950, only 50,000 designated their occupations before coming to Israel; 98,000 were dependent upon relief; and details were lacking concerning the occupations of the remaining 22,000 immigrants. Of those who designated their occupations before coming to Israel, almost one-half (22,500) were craftsmen, production process workers, and laborers; almost 8,000 were merchants and other sales people; more than 7,000 were clerical and government workers; about 4,500 were professionals and technicians; and about 1,350 were engaged in transportation as drivers, etc.

Among the craftsmen and other production workers, 7,139 (14.5 per cent of the total of those designating occupations) were tailors, seamstresses, and other kind of garment workers; 2,394 (4.8 per cent of the total number of
Means of Transportation

As in 1949, during 1950 transportation by airplane was most common; 54,920 emigrants, or almost one-third of the total immigration, came to Israel by this means, while a little more than 20 per cent had used this means of transportation during 1949. The proportion of immigration by air increased even more during the first half of 1951, reaching two-thirds of the total immigration. As a result, the cost of transportation, borne by the Jewish Agency alone, rose to an unprecedented height.

Balance of Migration

During 1950 a total of 225,335 persons entered Israel (of whom 211,697 were Jews), and 63,812 (of whom 51,588 were Jews) left Israel. The balance of migration therefore showed a surplus of 161,523 (of whom 160,109 were Jews). During 1950, 33,043 residents (of whom 29,158 were Jews) left the country, as compared with 17,461 (of whom 17,017 were Jews) during 1949; 22,723 residents returned to the country, as compared with 10,386 during 1949. Thus, the balance of migration of residents during 1950 concluded with a deficit of 10,170 in comparison with 7,075 during 1949.

Tourism

The movement of tourists increased during 1950. A total of 32,842 tourists came to Israel, as compared with 22,208 during 1948.

Dov Tibbon

Israel and the United Nations

The question of Palestine, one of the more permanent items on the General Assembly's agenda, was somewhat overshadowed at that organization's fifth session by the Korean issue.

Palestine Conciliation Commission

On September 2, 1950 the United Nations (UN) Palestine Conciliation Commission (PCC), consisting of France, Turkey, and the United States, submitted its eighth report to the Fifth General Assembly. It described the matters at issue as follows:
Israel advocated direct Arab-Israel negotiations, whereas the Arabs insisted on indirect negotiations through the Commission. The Commission itself had proposed on March 29, 1950 that direct negotiations be conducted in mixed committees, with the Commission acting as mediator.

The Arabs wished to make the peace negotiations contingent on Israel's agreeing to receive back and compensate all Arab refugees. Israel, while declining to accept any such condition, indicated its willingness to assist in settling the refugee problem and offered to admit 100,000 Arab refugees as part of any peace settlement.

Israel sought to maintain existing territorial boundaries, only stating its desire to negotiate over the Gaza strip which Egypt held, and certain northern areas in the possession of the Jewish state. The Arabs took the view that there should be a reversion to the partition borders, including the cession by Israel of the Negev and eastern Galilee.

**SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT**

In a supplementary report submitted to the Secretary General on October 23, 1950, the Commission called for a negotiated peace in Palestine, and recommended that the General Assembly urge Arabs and Jews "to engage without delay in direct discussions under the auspices of the United Nations." On the issue of the refugees, it proposed the return of as many of the refugees to Israel, as would be consistent with their own best interests, immediate payment of compensation for their lost property to refugees who did not return, and their resettlement in the Arab countries with the technical and financial assistance of the UN.

**Assembly Resolution on Refugees and Arab Resettlement**

In line with the above proposals, the General Assembly on December 14, 1950 adopted a resolution submitted by the Ad Hoc Political Committee (which was created by the Assembly to deal with the entire Palestine problem). The Assembly recalled its resolution of December, 1948, which had declared that all refugees wishing to return to their homes should be permitted to do so, those not returning to be compensated for their abandoned property. This resolution, the Assembly noted with concern, had not been implemented. It therefore directed the PCC to establish a special office to assess and pay compensation; work out practicable arrangements for the repatriation and resettlement of refugees; and continue consultations with the Israel and Arab governments on measures for protecting the rights, property, and interests of the refugees. These governments were also asked not to discriminate in any way against repatriated or resettled refugees.

**ASSISTANCE TO PALESTINIAN REFUGEES**

On November 1, 1950 Major General Howard Kennedy, director of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, whose Advisory Commission consisted of France, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States, submitted his report to the Ad Hoc Political Committee.
In his report Kennedy stated that the relief and works programs recommended in 1949 by the UN Economic Survey Mission for the Middle East had been only partly implemented. He pointed out that the number of refugees enabled to become self-supporting had not been as large as the Economic Survey Mission had anticipated. Moreover, the contributions received from the governments of member and non-member states were less than the amounts recommended by the Economic Survey Mission, and did no more than cover the cost of minimum relief needs.

The Assembly on December 2, 1950, by a vote of 46-0 with six abstentions, endorsed the recommendation made by the Ad Hoc Political Committee. This resolution noted that contributions sufficient to carry out the program authorized by the General Assembly resolution had not been made, and urged non-contributing governments to make every effort to do so. It recognized that direct relief could not be terminated by December 31, 1950, as had been envisaged, and authorized the Agency to continue to furnish direct relief to refugees. It estimated that approximately $20,000,000 would be needed for this program for the period July 1, 1951 to June 30, 1952. It considered that the re-integration of the refugees into the economic life of the Near East, either by repatriation or resettlement, was essential, and instructed the Agency to establish a re-integration fund to which not less than $30,000,000 should be contributed between July 1, 1951, and June 30, 1952.

Internationalization of Jerusalem

The Ad Hoc Political Committee also had to wrestle with the still unsolved question of the future of Jerusalem, and was called on to discuss the special report of the Trusteeship Council. By an almost unanimous decision the Trusteeship Council referred the question of the internationalization of Jerusalem to the General Assembly, by which it had been charged on December 9, 1949, with completing and implementing a draft statute for the Holy City to take the place of the 1948 draft statute.

The Council had also been asked to proceed immediately with the implementation of the statute. But its chairman, Roger Garreau, received no reply from Jordan; as a result he consulted only the government of Israel, which communicated new proposals.

No Action on Jerusalem

The question of the internationalization of Jerusalem and its environs reached an impasse when the only proposal on this subject failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority at the General Assembly's Fifth Session. This proposal, by Belgium, called for a four-member committee to study the terms of a settlement which would ensure the effective protection, under UN auspices, of the Holy Places and the spiritual and religious interests of the Holy Land.

Israel issued a statement noting that the defeat of the Belgian resolution was evidence "that the international community does not desire to impose a regime on the people of Jerusalem against their will."
Armistice Issues Before the Security Council

As an indirect consequence of the failure of the UN to resolve the grave political issues dividing Israel and the Arab states, the year under review (July 1, 1950, through June 30, 1951) was punctuated with innumerable incidents, military and otherwise, which were generally settled, or at least kept within bounds, by the Mixed Armistice Commissions. The latter were sometimes by-passed when charges (of territorial violations, etc.) were made directly to the Security Council. Typical of the conflicts that reflected the unsettled conditions were those considered by the Security Council during six meetings held from October 10 to November 17, 1950.

Egypt, in a communication to the Secretary General on September 9, 1950, charged that on August 20, 1950 the Israel authorities had begun to expel all Bedouins from the demilitarized area of El Auja and its environs, and that by September 3, the number of expelled Bedouins had reached 4,071. The Egyptian government asked the UN to investigate the matter with a view to halting the expulsion of the Palestine Arab population from territory then under Jewish control.

In a cablegram dated September 10, 1950, the foreign minister of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan complained to the Secretary General that Jewish armed forces had violated the northern frontiers of Jordan by occupying a stretch of land situated at the confluence of the Yarmuk and Jordan rivers. The cablegram requested the Security Council to instruct the Jewish forces to withdraw from the territory. A further cablegram from Jordan's foreign minister requested the president of the Security Council to place this complaint on that body's agenda.

In answer to the above charges, Israel in a letter to the Secretary General dated September 15, 1950, denied that Israel was occupying any territory not its own under the General Armistice Agreements. Subsequently, on September 16, Israel complained to the Security Council that Jordan and Egypt were "officially and publicly threatening aggressive action" against her. Israel further requested the Security Council to place the following matters on its agenda: Egypt's barring of passage to Israel-bound shipping through the Suez Canal; Jordan's refusal to permit Israelis to visit Jewish Holy Places in Jordan-held territory; and the violation of armistice procedures by Egypt and Jordan.

After consultations with the three states and with Lt. Gen. William E. Riley, Chief of Staff of the UN Truce Supervisory Organization in Palestine, the Security Council called upon Egypt, Jordan, and Israel to settle their disputes by the procedures laid down in the armistice agreements.

In a resolution to this effect adopted on November 17, 1950, the Council also asked the Mixed Armistice Commission to give urgent attention to Egypt's complaint concerning the expulsion of Palestine Arabs; called upon the parties to give effect to Commission decisions on repatriation; empowered the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervisory Organization to make recommendations to the states concerned for controlling the movement of nomadic
Arabs; and called upon the governments concerned not to take any action involving the transfer of persons across frontiers without prior consultation through the Mixed Armistice Commission. The resolution "took notice" of Israel's agreement to withdraw its armed forces from Bir Quattar.

**Egyptian Blockade of Suez Canal**

Of greater international import was the issue of the Suez Canal. Abba Eban, the representative of Israel at the UN, stated before the Security Council on October 16, 1950 that Egypt's closing of the Suez Canal to shipping bound for Israel was not only "an illegitimate attempt to undermine Israel's economy by the use of force," it also meant the periodic molestation of the ships and vessels of member nations lawfully passing through the Canal. Eban referred to his previous statement of August 4, 1949, and to a supporting statement by Ralph J. Bunche, former acting mediator in Palestine, who had said: "There should be free movement of legitimate shipping, and no vestiges of the wartime blockade should be allowed to remain, as they are inconsistent with both the letter and the spirit of the armistice agreements."

Because the Security Council proposed that all the charges should be entertained by the Mixed Armistice Commission, Israel lodged its complaint against Egypt with the Israel-Egypt Mixed Armistice Commission. However, General Riley, chairman of the Commission, ruled that the Egyptian action, while hostile and aggressive, was not a hostile act as defined by the armistice agreement, which spoke only of acts committed by military or paramilitary groups.

On July 12, 1951 Israel therefore turned the Security Council to protest against Egypt's blockade of the Suez Canal.

On August 30, 1951 the Security Council passed a strongly worded resolution calling on Egypt to lift the restrictions imposed on the passage of Israel-bound shipping through the Suez Canal. It was noted that the Egyptian restrictions not only struck at Israel, but also at maritime powers not connected with the dispute—the United States, Britain, France, and Norway had individually protested the Egyptian action. The Israel government expressed its satisfaction "that the Security Council acted for peace and stability in the Near East as well as for freedom of commerce and the seas, thereby strengthening the armistice regime. . . ." Egypt's foreign minister, Mohammed Salah el Pasha, indicated that Egypt would disregard the Security Council's resolution when he stated on September 2, 1951: "Before Egypt is asked to comply with the Security Council decision, Israel should be asked to carry out previous United Nations' decisions."

**Huleh Incident**

The most protracted "local" quarrel that eventually found its way to the Security Council (on March 29, 1951) was that between Israel and Syria. It began earlier in the year when the Syrian delegation protested to the Israel-
Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission against Israel's project for draining the Huleh marshes and straightening and deepening the bed of the Jordan River between Lake Huleh and Lake Tiberius. After intermittent skirmishes in April between Syria and Israel, the Council on May 8, 1951, adopted a resolution calling upon the parties to the dispute to cease fighting. On May 18, 1951 it adopted a second resolution that (1) called upon Israel to suspend all work in the demilitarized zone until such time as an arrangement was made through the chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission for resuming the work; (2) stated it was inconsistent with the objectives of the armistice agreement to refuse to participate in meetings of the Commission; (3) found Israel's aerial action against Syria on April 5, 1951 to be a violation of the Council's resolution of July 15, 1948, and inconsistent with the terms of the armistice agreement and the obligations of the parties under the Charter; and (4) held that Arab civilians removed from the demilitarized zone by Israel should be permitted to return to their homes under the supervision of the Commission, and that no such transfers should be undertaken in the future without the consent of the chairman of the Commission.

There was considerable disagreement over the interpretation of the Council's resolution. After six weeks, on June 28, 1951, General Riley reported there was little prospect of a solution being reached through the Mixed Armistice Commission, and that recourse to the Security Council might again be necessary. At the time of this writing, (September, 1951) however, negotiations were still being conducted through the Israel-Syria Mixed Armistice Commission. The major objective of replacing warfare with negotiation had been accomplished.

Louis Shub