

C  
O  
P  
Y

THE CENTRAL DISPENSARY AND EMERGENCY HOSPITAL  
1711 New York Avenue, N.W.  
WASHINGTON 6, D.C.

Room 631

July 6, 1957

Dear Moe,

I write informally from one Emergency institution to another - to enclose the final reparation Fund payment due to JDC to make up the full JDC share of 40% of 90% ( = 36% ) of the \$ 25 Million allocation. The enclosed is in conformity with the Fund's Condition Statement which is in final drap and which will be forwarded to you in the next few weeks. That report will show dates - amounts and types of currencies paid since 1946.

This is, of course, exclusion of special funds (such as the Italian Lira Grant) which are not taken into account in the \$ 25 Million allocation.

This payment brings the reparation program to a happy and successful - though very delayed end.

A formal covering letter will be sent when I get out of this jail - which I hope won't be in the too distant future.

I'm told I'm making very good recovering, but I won't know for at least another week whether the normal 6 week period is likely to be shortened.

Many thanks for your call the other day.

Best regards

Abba

*98 pages*

*2 Copies  
Please*

COPY

JDC ARCHIVES  
AR 45/64  
#3840

DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
Washington

May 27, 1953

My dear Mr. Javits:

Reference is made to your letter of May 11, 1953 and to the Department's telephone acknowledgment of May 20, 1953 regarding the sums remaining to be paid for the relief and rehabilitation of non-repatriable victims of Nazi action out of the proceeds of German external assets from certain neutral countries.

I wish to thank you for the congratulations which you extended to the Department for its part in obtaining a favorable settlement under the Swiss-Allied Accord on German External Assets.

The Swiss-Allied Agreement on German assets which was signed last August came into force on March 19, 1953 after the related Swiss-German Agreement was ratified by the Federal Republic of Germany. As provided in the former agreement, Switzerland, on April 2, 1953, paid to the Allied Governments the sum of 101,500,000 Swiss Francs after having deducted the sum of 20,000,000 Swiss francs as repayment for funds previously advanced by Switzerland to the IRO for the benefit of non-repatriable victims of Nazi action. With respect to the additional sum of 17,200,000 Swiss francs, following the submission of the recent Interim Progress Report of the Liquidating Trustee of the Reparation Refugee Fund some questions were raised regarding the precise exchange rates at which earlier sums were transferred and consequently the dollar equivalent of the amount already paid. The Liquidating Trustee has, however, recently submitted clarifying information which has been reviewed and accepted by the Department, but, so far, the appropriate British officials have not completed their review. The Department is hopeful that the British review will be completed in the very near future and that payment of these funds can then be made without further delay.

In addition to the foregoing information, it will be of interest to you to learn that last January the three Allies reached an agreement among themselves recognizing the obligation incurred under Article 8 of the Paris Reparation Agreement to make available to the specified refugee agencies the full amount of the prescribed \$25,000,000. In addition, the three Allies are making further efforts to obtain the 100,000,000 escudos. In this connection, negotiations began with the Portuguese Government on May 22 in Lisbon for the purpose of reaching a settlement of the German asset problem. Every effort will be made to obtain early payment of the 100,000,000 escudos.

The Department appreciates your interest in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

The Honorable  
J. K. Javits  
House of Representatives  
Washington

For the Acting Secretary of State:  
Thurston B. Morton  
Assistant Secretary

13 January 1953

Dear Mr. Warren,

1. Here at last is the delivery on my promise to send you more data on the \$40,000,000 - which is, in fact, upwards of \$41,600,000 with more figures added since I first made it up in October 1951.

Abba also told me that the other papers I gave you got mislaid in a shuffle. I hoped to get duplicates off to you before New Years but this HQ practically disintegrated for the holiday, including practically all secretaries and just about all the IRO Liquidator's staff from whom I hoped to obtain a few missing items.

2. Now I have re-worked the memo to replace the one I gave you. This one is considerably longer with more illustrations and more narrative description to give you talking points if you need them. I have quoted some performance figures where I could, against financial grants or payments. I hoped to obtain more of these from IRO files but the old records have been rearranged for archives or history and it will take further time to dig out what I am looking for.

3. I can eventually obtain more agency report data in due time but I will not hold this up for that. I have picked up a few items that were still around in my office, recalled one or two figures that were safe in my memory and made an approximate calculation of some others (e.g. hard core cases against certain grants). If you get stuck for more meanwhile several of the agencies in New York will quickly supply you with impressive performance figures, e.g.:

NTAA - estimate<sup>d</sup> non-agency cases handled.

The principal resettlement agencies - number of hard core and difficult cases, total budgets contributed from private funds etc.

The American Council - has the record of opportunities found by the Committee on Professionals (to place professional DPs).

4. Before making public use of unpublished agency material it is a good idea to check anyway. Some of my figures are probably conservative, being based on the minimum agency obligation under an agreement, which was frequently exceeded without the excess being reported (since they were not getting any IRO money for this).

5. You will also find enclosed a revised summary table of grants, payments and logistical support totalling \$41,622,576. The IRO funds involved are this sum less the estimated \$7,953,174 in DMS from the Occupational Budget in Germany, i.e. \$33,669,302. While these figures are carried out to odd digits they are not exact and can be used in a rounded off form and be just as close to the truth. It would be preferable to round them off if there is any risk of conveying the impression that they are exact. The reasons for inexactitude are the following:

Mr. George Warren,  
Westchester Apartments,  
4000 Cathedral Avenue,  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
U.S.A.

- 2 -

(a) IRO Logistical Support (column 2 in the summary table): Much of this was given in kind, especially in the first two years, with a theoretical value placed upon the amount drawn by the agencies that was sometimes the subject of argument. E.g. IRO Supply and Transport officers were inclined to insist that vehicle spares, tires and repairs were used up for agency vehicles to the full allowance estimated for them whereas the agencies constantly complained that the spare parts and tires would not fit their vehicles, or that stocks were "out" when they needed them. From spot checks and other information we sometimes discounted an official budget figure in estimating the actual value drawn by the agency. As time went on we won S and T cooperation in more exact assessments in most areas; also more and more of logistical support in later years was given in the form of cash or ration books of stated value and our later budgeting was quite exact with close adjustments every quarter. My figures are however estimated expenditures, all reconciled with the budget office, but not the official accounts in which these logistical items are all buried in general operational codes.

(b) The Occupational Budget: Even more than the dollar logistical budget these figures include estimates of value in kind, and are sometimes extensions of known figures: e.g. an available estimate for the German fiscal year (ends in April) adapted to IRO's year, taking into account numbers of personnel and vehicles in bridging the three months of difference in terminal dates. In the French and British Zones where IRO had little part in the management of the DM budget it was difficult to obtain (until very late in the operation) close estimates of the DM values to be properly charged as support to agencies. In the U.S. Zone the main difficulty was to determine the separate values to agencies of common installations, pooled services or facilities that they shared with IRO. These items could not be reduced beyond a rough estimate without considerable administrative expense. It is quite possible that in all Zones we have underestimated the value of the DM budget to the agencies. On the other hand, it was often a matter of local convenience in the early days whether local personnel on the DM budget were listed officially as IRO or agency employees. I remember once, for example, when some IRO camps having been ordered to reduce DF camp workers on the payroll to 6% of the camp population or something, simply transferred the excess to an agency's nominal list of indigenous employees! However, that was a situation which was overcome early on. With the agencies we treated the DM and dollar budgets with equal seriousness as parts of the whole and this was applied with greater force and with more willing acceptance on their part as time went on.

(c) In some far away Missions and perhaps others nearer home, there were probably some financial transactions with agencies buried in codes for reception costs, a few movements and other things which were part of the Mission's budget but were actually executed by a local agency for the Mission. An agency regularly active at a port not regularly used by IRO (HIAS at Marseilles) sometimes did port work for IRO, and booked passages for migrants on commercial ships, providing these services at cost which was paid by the IRO Mission in France. I am sure our Headquarters figures have not caught up with all these odd items. The purpose of my analysis was to show the magnitude and character of IRO's financial relations with the agencies and to estimate its proportions. I think we have put together all that matters.

- 3 -

6. The other equally interesting side of the picture would be the aggregate financial investments of the agencies in the IRO program. This involves many budgets of autonomous national agencies as well as their international counterparts and breakdowns as to refugee categories (IRO or non-IRO) or of relief contributions to Europe (as between refugees and local populations) are difficult to obtain. NCWC received from the Bishops Relief Campaigns in the U.S. over \$4,600,000 for DP relief and resettlement from 1947 to 31 October 1951. (This is not a published figure and should not be publicly used without consent). From 1948 to 1951 the Lutheran World Federation invested \$1,744,752 in service to refugees. To this must be added more from the separate budgets of counterpart agencies. In their brief to the Ford Foundation the four principal agencies estimated that, in co-operation with IRO, they had made possible the resettlement of 690,000 refugees. In the same period they distributed relief goods (not confined to IRO refugees) to the value of \$240,000,000. This astronomical total, however, includes supplies they received free or at nominal cost from the U.S. surplus goods program. When PCIRO began a rough estimate showed that the aggregate budgets of all agencies for refugees and related work was not far below the total for PCIRO itself. Of course, AIDC was a heavy weighting factor in this. I would guess that this aggregate is considerably less now, but it helped to save the day for IRO refugees when PCIRO care and maintenance funds were so inadequate to the need. It was such aid which provided the means of life to many IRO refugees in France, Austria and elsewhere until IRO could take them on. These sources saved the day again for many when the IRO care and maintenance program ended.

7. Now in addition to the enclosed summary table of IRO grants and payments to agencies I am sending you the breakdown sheets for the first three years and the last 18 months (some of whose items spilled over a bit into 1952). These will give you the complete list of projects supported by grants or reimbursed by payments. In comparing these with the summary table please note the following difference in classification of grants to refugee service committees:

In the breakdown sheets they are shown for 1949/50 and for the final 18 months under reimbursements for basic IRO programs - the category in which they probably most nearly belong.

In the summary table I merely lifted them out into a separate column of their own, and the "reimbursement" totals in Column 5 are correspondingly reduced from the reimbursement totals in the breakdown sheets.

8. My narrative notes will give you a fair amount of description of the agency projects listed in the breakdown sheets. To this I will add more later, but will not hold up the present material for this further detail. Please excuse the messy look of some pages. I wrote them before all figures used were verified and corrected, and re-typing might delay this beyond the moment when you need it - our secretaries are in short supply just now.

9. The breakdown sheets show only the lump sum totals for IRO logistical support but I enclose a sample tabulation which we used to keep current routinely quarter by quarter with control of savings and adjustment of the budget quarter by quarter (e.g. two weeks subsistence allowance if a departing agency staff member was not replaced for a fortnight), with estimates of actual expenditures - kept up to date as we went along. Nothing ever stayed

- 4 -

put for very long among 20 to 30 agency programs, embracing numerous service projects in 5 different field areas. But we used the savings on some to take care of the new contingencies in others and thus maintained flexibility within authorized overall limits, usually with a final net saving at the end of the year. The logistical budget and much of the project budgeting was very like the cooperative budgeting of a community chest - with a large number of agency programs the breaks come both ways and the variation of detail throughout the year is not revealed in the overall total expended.

10. Most of the project grants were budgeted from a Special Projects Fund for agency programs set up in our Plan of Expenditure each year (thanks to Gertrude Gates). Items in the reimbursement column came from other basic IRO codes - for care and maintenance, movements, vocational training, rehabilitation etc., within the totals budgeted for those programs, but once in a while when some of these funds ran short I had to absorb some part of an otherwise basic service in the Projects Fund. A separate reserve was set up for refugee service Committees, and grants for hard core and some borderline came from the hard core fund. The Stopped DM Account (as distinct from the occupation budget) was the source for substantial DM grants for residual programs which are not shown separately as DM grants in our tables but are expressed in their dollar values and form the substantial part of these grants to certain agencies.

11. I have numbered the paragraphs in this letter and the columns in the summary table so that you can refer to them conveniently if you need a quick answer on a further detail. I have also numbered the breakdown sheets and the items appearing on them.

With my very warm regards to you and to other familiar faces in the adjoining rooms,

Yours sincerely,

Marjorie Bradford

Geneva

17 January 1953

Dear Abba,

Several days ago I sent the material on the \$40,000,000 (IRO) to Mr. Warren - to his private home address. I don't know whether you need or want to be bothered with a second copy, but here is one just in case. I intended to send it to you the same day as Mr. Warren's copy but got bogged down. If you have no particular use for it please invest in some postage and send it back to me, for I would have use for some spare copies. I am referring to the memo and tables - not the letter to Mr. Warren.

Before sending it I asked Col. Cound to go through it all - I did not want to send it without his full knowledge or approval. He said it was a most thorough exposé of the subject.

As noted in my letter to Mr. Warren I put in as many performance figures against grants as I could but more requires digging in old IRO files. Now, when IRO started resorting its files for archives and history it appointed a new-fangled filing "expert" who proceeded to disorganize the filing system so that nobody could find anything, and I have not had time enough to be persistent enough yet.

But a few agencies around New York could supply a lot more on performance figures and quickly, if the need arises before I can dig it out. Mr. Warren was very anxious to have quotable figures to show that a particular grant or payment did something definitive for x people. I have produced some of the main items but there are many others. If there is any jam over it meanwhile I suggest you ask Ruth Tropin for some personal help in getting together some agency figures against the various grants listed in the tables. Let her read this stuff and pick up the further dope needed. She is our port liaison and PI officer in NY; she did the same for IRO, and has maintained agency relations in a general way too. They all know her and trust her.

Much of this is also familiar to Gertrude Gates. She was always of enormous help on my budget problems and affairs. She approached budgeting as programming in a sense in which some budgeteers are deficient. She was always interested in the substance, quality and basic reasons for the program and for the method by which it was carried out, as well as in its costs and dimensions. She sometimes knew more of what it was about than some "program" people. Marie Lane (now in FSA) could also fill in many illustrations or relevant information on IRO's care and maintenance program carried out through voluntary agencies in France and elsewhere in Western Europe. This arrangement was inherited in some of these areas from IGCR. The refugees were never concentrated in DP camps - they were living all over the country. When IRO looked at the cost of setting up its own operating staff (especially in France), and taking the rap for its insufficient C and M funds, it quickly abandoned the idea of a direct operation. Its operating staff in western Europe was mainly for resettlement, with a minimum staff mainly to supervise, coordinate and budget the C and M side of the program executed by the agencies (relief, medical, vocational training, rehabilitation, and in many cases permanent local settlement of the case). The latter solution was often feasible in these countries whereas it was not feasible in Germany, Austria and Italy. Also in Western Europe many refugees could find jobs and support themselves even if they resettled later on, whereas the percentage who could do this in the "DP countries" was much smaller. Through local agencies one could therefore juggle the budget among cases with full relief, partial relief or no relief at all when they could support themselves even temporarily

Mr. Abba Schurts,  
1722 Jefferson Place North West,  
WASHINGTON 6, D.C.

- 2 -

or qualified for sufficient public assistance to keep them. This program in Western Europe was much like a relief program back home. ①

If we could add together the whole IRO story <sup>②</sup> plus your Reparations story, plus the value of U.S. surplus goods and shipping provided to the agencies, plus the aggregate of the agencies' own budgets in all countries and the enormous other contributions they gathered up from private donors in their used clothing and "cans of beans" collections, and all the things that the ladies' sewing circles did, plus the uncalculated funds expended by local sponsoring agencies, churches and individuals in resettlement countries, the figures would be staggering for the programs which were sparked by the internationally working agencies, or for which they were used as the effective instruments.

Whether their work was good, bad or indifferent (and it included all three) it represented a force of enormous power in the world - fortunately perhaps, not all going in the same directions! It was really a composite of forces, parallel, contending for place, sometimes in conflict with each other or the powers-that-be, and prompted by different motives and philosophies, which of course is what provides the balance to make democracy safe for the world and the pressure valves to keep its equilibrium adjusted. Millions of people (and I mean millions) were participating in these voluntary programs sufficiently (as helpers or as helped) to feel an identification with them and with their aspirations. As one example, when 20,000 Lutherans gathered in Hannover for the LWF Assembly a few months ago they represented 60,000,000 people throughout the world. They issued a challenge to action and a mandate on the refugee problem and it will probably find its way or make itself felt to every self-sustaining Lutheran Church on this side of the Iron Curtain (and perhaps in some fashion some of the 20,000,000 Lutherans behind it). This covers a large part of the land masses of our globe. (Incidentally, even Finland is now a financial contributor to the LWF budget for its international work.)

I am sorry that the attached material is not all in apple pie order either as to composition or typing. My memo was a first draft which I had no time to edit or have retyped for corrections.

This week I got WCC, NCWC and ISS together in a meeting on Trieste. HQ representatives of WCC and NCWC will be together in Trieste on a visit next week. They asked me whether it was safe to proceed with some action (commitments). I told them I thought it fairly safe although I could not offer the guarantee yet that we actually had the money in hand.

Yours sincerely,

*MMB*

- ① Some other IRO reasons for using agencies were more odd but not less logical. e.g. while we were fighting with the Austrians over currency facilities and funds etc., we formed out a rehabilitation institution to the YMOA/YWCA together with some of our local staff, because it was unsafe to give away on the principle in our fight.
- ② To this must still be added the IRO liquidation grants. Mr Warren receives reports direct from Col Count on liquidation. (Distinct from some post-facto payments on IRO business which he dispensed because they came after February - these are included in my tables)

## IRO FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH VOLUNTARY AGENCIES

1. An unique feature of the IRO program was the scale on which it mobilized, coordinated and brought to bear upon an international problem the combined resources and combined or parallel actions of governments, international and national voluntary societies, and of the intergovernmental organization itself known as IRO. IRO by constitution was an intergovernmental agency. Its PROGRAM, however, embraced the combination of integrated and parallel activities of governments and voluntary societies in and about its framework. They all regarded these activities as "part of the IRO program" which, in the broader meaning of the term which was generally accepted or implied, represented a great deal more than the personnel directly employed by IRO could do with their own hands. Financially, it also represented a great deal more than the funds which flowed directly through IRO's own budget.

### The U.S. Resettlement Program

2. For example, IRO's largest resettlement program, to the United States, involved a field organization and shipping program financed through IRO's own budget. But it also depended upon not only U.S. legislation but also the activities and budgets of the Displaced Persons Commission, the expanded consular work, the INS, Public Health Service and so on. Furthermore, it depended upon millions of dollars of additional expenditure by voluntary agencies from funds raised from private sources, for selection and processing of candidates, sponsorships, placements, assurances, bonds for some cases, reception, inland transportation and subsequent medical or other assistance to individual cases to which some misfortune befell.

3. Examples of agency loans to migrants after arrival in the U.S. for inland transportation, maintenance pending placement, medical care etc:

Lutheran Resettlement Service loans from November 1948 to end of 1951 totalled \$1,085,217. These were made to nearly 11,000 families, (probably 20,000 to 25,000 persons).

National Catholic Welfare Conference similarly loaned from October 1948 through September 1952 (a slight overlapping into the Migration Committee program) \$3,348,793 for about 65,500 persons.

These loan figures should not be used publicly without checking with the National Lutheran Council and the National Catholic Welfare Conference. They only reflect, of course, a fraction of the agency's financial commitments for activities in the United States. Sponsorship and placement services, bonds, reception activities, the care and forwarding of many compassionate cases, or a "hard core" case for placement in an institution do not appear in loans at all. Nor do the field organization and expenditures in Europe, the general promotion and organization work and the administrative overhead for the program, of which certain logistical support furnished by IRO (only for European field organizations) provided a very small fraction.

4. Now what did IRO provide from its own budget to support these voluntary resettlement programs for the United States?

(a) Logistical support in DP areas: For all voluntary programs in certain of the principal European field areas (Germany, Austria and Italy) IRO provided from its own funds an estimated \$3,466,383 in logistical support to all voluntary programs in the field - assistance to personnel, vehicles, for accommodation etc. We cannot separate U.S. resettlement from other resettlement or non-resettlement activities under the above over all figure. The agencies maintained unified field organizations for administrative economy and efficiency. Their require-

- 2 -

ments which IRO could subsidize were determined by budget procedure every three months for all services in the agency's field organization and the same staff at different periods were engaged in different activities, or at all times in a combination of programs. Moreover, the above figure is an estimate of value rather than an exact figure. Much logistical support, particularly in earlier years, was furnished in kind rather than in cash support to an agency. Frequently an agency was sharing a physical facility with IRO itself - a common warehouse, common use of a vehicle pool, joint office accommodation etc.

(b) Grants for U.S. resettlement projects beyond the normal resettlement programs of the resettlement agencies:

Committee on Professionals - \$90,000

This was a joint committee formed by the principal agencies to find opportunities for professional people. It found and classified many hundreds of opportunities, and did an important promotional work for the solution of this problem which facilitated the work of all the resettlement agencies. The actual immigration resulting was absorbed within the programs of the individual agencies. The American Council of Voluntary Agencies is the custodian of the records of this Committee.

National Travellers Aid Society - \$131,800

This grant was for an expanded service by this society to cover reception, temporary care or special emergencies and onforwarding to destination of "non-agency cases" in the U.S. program. It was a necessary facility to enable many persons with personal assurances but not part of the clientele of any agency to reach their destinations.

(c) Resettlement of persons needing rehabilitation to fit them for employment: \$842,500. A number of agencies shared the IRO grants and the corresponding obligations for these projects - notably National Catholic Welfare Conference, United Service for New Americans, National Lutheran Council and Church World Service and the following others - International Society for the Welfare of Cripples, International Rescue Committee and the American Federation of International Institutes. The minimum obligation assumed by the agencies was the resettlement in the U.S., rehabilitation, placement and future responsibility as required for some 1,600 physically handicapped persons (together with their families) requiring rehabilitation to fit them for employment. (These persons did not come within the Institutional Hard Core categories.) All agencies went beyond their minimum obligations in this program. From their reports it can be said that well over 2,000 cases were resettled, and the true figure is probably much greater, for beyond the discharge of the obligations within the agreements the agencies were not required to submit special case reports. NCMC alone, which accepted an obligation for 500 such cases (i.e. probably 1,500 to 2,000 persons including family members) subsequently reported that it had extended its project to at least 1,000 cases of this kind. IRO did not have funds to provide grants for further numbers in this category but the activities stimulated by these special grants did, in fact, set projects in motion which in the end did extend to many others with the necessary further aid from private funds. It should also be mentioned that there were a high proportion of bonds on these particular cases. Some would also require future periodic remedial (e.g. orthopedic) treatment. The agencies' special obligations met from private funds therefore came to much more than IRO's taken grants which merely helped meet the first expenses of care and special placement work required.

(d) GWS/Tolstoy Foundation (Kalauks) \$482,000 \*

The successful resettlement in the U.S. of some 400 Kalauks hinged upon this special project, helped by a number of agencies, which an IRO subsidy made possible. We say "made possible" because this and other special projects, including the one for rehabilitation cases mentioned

\* For a minimum of 400 persons plus grants for 63 hard core with 24 dependents

- 3 -

above, were beyond the agencies' already fully committed budgets in the latter period of IRO.

(e) Hard Core grants: Until its terminal period IRO paid "hard core" grants, case by case for certifiable cases to the sponsoring agency or institution upon arrival in an immigration country and a proportion of these cases were resettled in the U.S. with the aid of numerous agencies and institutions. All such cases were certified by IRO staff. The grants were a mere token of the financial obligations of the accepting agency responsible for lifetime care, ranging from \$1,000 for a TB case down through different categories of handicap to \$500 for an old age case. Toward the end of its program when IRO was phasing out and no longer able to maintain the difficult case by case negotiations this program required, IRO requested several principal agencies to continue this work, granting lump sum settlements (see below) for an estimated number of cases. It could not be ascertained in advance which of these, or how many, would be placed in the U.S. but a certain proportion of them were placed in the future charge of agencies in that country (AJDC or USNA, NCWC, NLC and CWS).

5. For the above special resettlement projects alone, all in the U.S. and all in the last 18 months of IRO's existence, \$1,144,000 was expended by IRO on behalf of special groups of hard-to-resettle cases (or non-agency cases) other than institutional hard core. This aid provided opportunities for at least 2,000 physically handicapped cases (probably 6,000 or more persons including family members otherwise blocked for resettlement), 400 Kalmuks, some thousands of other persons having personal sponsors in the U.S. but lacking the services of a resettlement agency overseas, and many professionals subsequently sponsored by the resettlement agencies when their joint committee had helped in the canvass of opportunities for them. IRO's hard core grants, given through agencies, are not dealt with country by country, (see below) but a substantial part of these grants were given on behalf of cases for which these agencies undertook lifetime care, free from public expense, in U.S. institutions. Of the figures given for logistical support provided by IRO funds for the agencies' field programs in Europe it is safe to estimate that at least \$1,000,000 was in support of the U.S. resettlement program which became the heaviest single factor in all their field activities.

6. Setting aside logistical support which was a general subsidy to field programs, it will be seen that the funds expended in the projects described above were on behalf of refugees with a resettlement handicap. The agency was the instrument through which the task was accomplished but the funds were in no sense a subsidy to the agency's normal program. On the contrary, the agency was also raising special funds, beyond its normal budget, to care for these cases and incurred a corresponding financial obligation at least equal to, and in many instances beyond, that of IRO for the same case. In some instances limited help from IRO served to stimulate a project which then went beyond these limits on its own momentum. More particularly, IRO's share came to the rescue especially in the latter half of its program when voluntary budgets were no longer equal to the demands of the extended and expanded ~~immigration~~ U.S. D.P. program. For all the same types of cases the agencies had expended their own funds without IRO participation at an earlier stage but the stepped up demands toward the end were beyond their fund raising limits. For most of the 300,000 persons who went to the United States the IRO resettlement program was uniquely a voluntary program. If one attempted to define the "basic" and the "supplementary" services in this program according to the ultimate per capita expenditures of the organizations involved, the "Basic" would probably have to be awarded to the voluntary agencies and the "supplementary" to IRO in the narrow or literal meaning of its name. But these agencies regarded their activities as an integral part of what everyone called "the IRO program".

- 4 -

The Resettlement Program to Israel  
and other Movements from Special Areas

7. IRO's second largest resettlement program - to Israel - reflects still another relationship with its associated agencies. In this important program the agencies (American Joint Distribution Committee and Jewish Agency for Palestine) executed, on IRO's behalf, practically the entire program including processing and movement (shipping and to a large extent inland transportation to port of embarkation). For the movement of close to 120,000 migrants in this program IRO expended through these two agencies about \$10,250,000. This was a reimbursement for basic services furnished by them on IRO's behalf. The arrangement was an administrative and operational economy for IRO, both in respect of staff and in respect of shipping for it involved considerable field organization in some areas where IRO did not have to maintain extensive installations for other reasons and the shipping was off the lanes for IRO's chartered fleet. The financial figure given also includes a post facto reimbursement for some movements carried on by these agencies during the period of hostilities when IRO movements were suspended.

8. The reimbursements for this program were at first made as payments of individual verified claims. The accounting and auditing both for IRO and the agencies proved to be a substantial administrative expense and sometimes occasioned great delay in repayments. After a substantial number of movements had taken place, however, it proved feasible to establish from the greatly varying cost factors applicable to individual cases, an over all per capita average. Subsequent movements were therefore paid for at a per capita rate for verified movements. These rates were adjusted when important price changes for transportation affected the average.

9. The field programs of these agencies also participated in the logistical support provided by IRO to all approved programs in the several principal DP countries.

10. At different times and in different areas IRO made similar arrangements with AJDC, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society and to a much smaller extent, with several other agencies for individual migration movements which they executed on IRO's behalf. A further \$5,800,000 approximately was expended by IRO through AJDC and HIAS, for example, for movements to destinations other than Israel which they executed for IRO. To a considerable extent such arrangements were made in IRO's (and PCIRO's) earlier operations before the chartered fleet was built up. Otherwise they generally applied to areas of embarkation and destination which were off the travelled routes of IRO ships, and their purpose was to effect an operational economy for IRO while not imposing an undue burden upon the agency which already had facilities in those areas. Some movements from Western Europe, from China, from other outlying areas, and to such places as South Africa and certain parts of South America were included. IRO reimbursements for these movements were made according to individual claims or per capita rates that were in all cases previously verified by IRO as within the rates that would have been paid had IRO executed these movements directly.

11. From the above figures it will be seen that well over two-thirds of IRO total estimated expenditures through voluntary agencies which are classified as "reimbursements for basic IRO programs" were the shipping costs for movements executed by certain agencies on IRO's behalf, including practically the entire program to Israel - IRO's second largest resettlement program.

Other Basic Field Programs

12. In Western European countries and to some extent in other areas which were "outlying areas" in relation to the geographical locations of IRO's own principal field organizations, national or international voluntary agencies executed IRO's care and maintenance program under the oversight of a small IRO mission which utilized the services of these agencies instead of employing

- 5 -

an operational staff of its own. In France, for example, some 300,000 refugees under the IRO mandate were not concentrated in camps but were in communities all over the country. A number of voluntary agencies, notably the French Branch of International Social Service which had local or regional offices throughout the country staffed by competent caseworkers, utilized IRO's limited care and maintenance funds (a budget far from equal to all possible claims against it) to assist the most needy individual cases, and to obtain for them also all possible help from sources other than IRO, including French public assistance. In few instances was IRO able to offer any administrative support in return for such services and these countries (other than Germany, Austria and Italy) were outside the areas where IRO logistical support was provided to cooperating agencies. IRO's own budget was never sufficient to man all these areas properly, nor to provide administrative compensation to the agencies executing its program. Such compensation was fragmentary, but when given (for extra staff, travel and office expenses) it was usually at the point where the agency's own administrative budget was exhausted and it could no longer continue the service without some aid. Several American agencies served as the IRO representation in Spain and Portugal for example. They performed all IRO functions, subject to general supervision as to eligibility of refugees, and as to program and budget. For a considerable period these agencies carried on without IRO administrative aid but their IRO programs were subsequently budgeted, supervised and controlled in all respects like an IRO mission. But IRO's relief to refugees expended through these agencies was substantial. In 1949/50 they distributed on IRO's behalf, for example, \$2,806,213 in cash assistance to refugees in Belgium, France, Netherlands, Spain, Portugal and Luxembourg. This figure appears in the estimates for "reimbursements for basic services" in IRO's financial transactions with voluntary agencies.

13. In IRO's principal European field areas the agencies took over partial or total management responsibility for many IRO specialized programs. During the last 18 months of IRO operations this practice was expanded to facilitate the phasing out of IRO operations with minimum loss to the constantly reducing program and maximum gain in operational economy.

#### Some Examples

Resettlement orientation and language training programs operated for IRO by the YMCA/YWCA in Germany and Austria, grants established by quarterly budget reviews - \$85,500. Many thousands of refugees benefited from these programs whose greatest and chronic operational problem was the constant turnover of the agency-trained volunteer refugee teachers who were so quickly resettled themselves after they had received their own language training. With modest equipment, physical facilities and training materials and a small corps of supervising personnel, the agency built these programs largely upon the talents and the volunteer aid of the refugees themselves.

Children's and Youth centers in Germany and Austria, staffed and managed in whole or in part by YMCA/YWCA, Unitarian Service Committee, American Friends Service Committee, and World University Service (students) - \$43,497. Although these centers for the care of unaccompanied children and youth were basic IRO tasks delegated in whole or in part to the agencies, the agencies themselves contributed much beyond this value from their own funds for staff and material supplies. The children's centers will strike a familiar note to most people. The youth centers did a spectacular job in gathering up hundreds of wandering unaccompanied refugee youths, often adult in some respects far beyond their years but nevertheless with all the immaturity of adolescents. Orphaned or cut adrift from their families, some of these youngsters had been in concentration camps or in forced labour from the age of 11 or 12 and one did not treat them as children. Indeed, it was often by the underground that they learned that the youth center was "a good place" and they would turn up to give it a try. Hundreds of teen-age youth were rehabilitated and resettled or reunited with their families as a result of the skilled and painstaking work of the agencies in these centers. \* The "centers"

\* The YMCA/YWCA youth center in Austria practically became a "pipeline" for Austria whose mission staff took a great personal interest in its work.

- 6 -

themselves were in some instances decrepit hutments which the young people themselves made livable.

Vocational Training and Rehabilitation: In Italy, the World ORT Union executed IRO's entire vocational training program for an extended period. In Germany and Austria ORT handled most of this work for Jewish refugees. It operated certain vocational rehabilitation projects for physically handicapped persons and post-TB cases. In the British Zone of Germany ORT also did IRO's trade testing for resettling DPs requiring trade certificates for resettlement selections. For these special basic services to IRO, beyond the supplementary training programs offered by this specialized agency, ORT received grants amounting to \$553,569.

For international casework services on long term difficult and children's cases where legal and other entanglements were obstacles to resettlement, International Social Service received some \$55,000 from IRO. Some thousands of persons were helped by this intensive work on their cases. They were subsequently resettled under IRO or agency-sponsored schemes, or if necessary locally settled in their country of residence. In much of this work ISS staff were assisting the personnel of IRO or of other agencies. The eventual solution of the case was in most instances a combined effort and one cannot say, for example, that a stated number of cases were resettled exclusively by these efforts of ISS. Toward the close of IRO operations ISS took over the records of thousands of unfinished cases where further action was pending, notably in the British Zone of Germany and in Italy, and agreed to pursue action or refer these cases to other quarters. In the U.S. Zone of Germany ISS took over from IRO many cases of unaccompanied children on which action for custody or guardianship was pending in the courts.

The above are merely illustrative examples of numerous projects in IRO's basic field program to which agencies contributed staff, management, material supplies or equipment. Many such contributions were never compensated by IRO grants for the IRO budget alone was never sufficient to embrace all the projects and services in the field that were featured in IRO/agency combined field operations. Finally, in September 1951, IRO turned over to the voluntary resettlement agencies the responsibility for the continuing programs and unfinished cases in individual migration, confining its own rapidly liquidating operations to its remaining mass resettlement schemes. For this additional burden assumed at a difficult time for all their programs, IRO was unable to grant the agencies any additional compensation whatever.

#### Other Special Projects

14. The differences between "reimbursements" to agencies for "basic services" and "grants" for special projects" were frequently differences of degree in basic priority rather than substance of the program. For example, the compensation to certain agencies for shipment of refugees moved for IRO was clearly a reimbursement. On the other hand grants of close to \$500,000 to several principal agencies for programs to aid potentially residual refugees in Germany, Austria and Italy after IRO's care and maintenance program ended in June 1950 were discretionary grants to assist these agencies with an undertaking highly important to the IRO program although not a mandatory responsibility of the Organization. Another \$380,000 to refugee service committees formed at IRO's instigation in outlying areas or countries other than those of IRO's principal field operations, *was partly for a transfer of services from IRO's causing distress and partly for facilities to refugees.*

15. In Germany, Austria and Italy several of the principal international agencies enlisted their national counterparts, in these combined programs to facilitate local settlement of some 200,000 residual refugees, and to provide further resettlement aid to those for whom opportunities could still be found. IRO's own continuing program from July 1 1950 was of necessity reduced to the limits of a much smaller budget, sufficient to cover only those refugees in the resettlement "pipeline". How extraordinarily successful were the so called "residual" programs of the agencies from the standpoint of resettlement

- 7 -

was attested by the thousands of refugees previously classified as "residual" who reappeared in the IRO "pipeline", thanks to the painstaking case by case attack on their problems by the international and local agencies. During a good part of 1951 fully 25% of the IRO resettlement caseload in some principal districts of Germany was drawn from refugees whom IRO had previously been forced to classify as "potentially residual" and transfer to the local economy in June 1950. These combined programs continue actively to this day both for local settlement and for resettlement with substantial contributions from private funds and some assistance furnished by other official programs.

16. Other special projects included a great variety of voluntary programs contributing directly to the rehabilitation and resettlement of IRO refugees. Thousands of refugee children participated in summer camps operated by the YMCA/YWCA, AJDC and other agencies. Their combined gains in weight totalled a good many tons and this was perhaps the least of the benefits to these children who often had known no home other than a small cubicle curtained by a blanket in a DP barracks. Agencies helped IRO to care for the aged and chronic sick and provided welfare programs, amenities, occupational therapy and supplementary rehabilitation services in hospitals and institutions. Grants totalling \$29,487 to a number of small resettlement projects assisted special teams of volunteer workers (giving temporary service in the field without salary) to select and document hard-to-resettle cases for the special dossiers and placements required for their resettlement; covered a small project of one agency to resettle several hundred persons including families of mixed marriage, unmarried mothers and others handicapped by family status; and assisted small projects for hard-to-resettle cases in Canada and Australia.

17. Agency vocational training programs in France, Belgium and the Netherlands were assisted by grants amounting to \$85,878 in 1949/50. A YMCA community program in the mining areas of Belgium received \$2700 to aid its important work among the DP miners recruited for that country, in a special effort to reduce the ranks of returnees to Germany. French voluntary agencies received \$131,373 in 1949/50 for rehabilitation services to handicapped refugees. In Austria the YMCA/YWCA was providing essential staff, services and program supplies for an IRO rehabilitation center, aided by an IRO grant of \$49,207.

18. Some of the above and many other projects of voluntary agencies receiving IRO grants were really a part of a combined or integrated activity which could not be said to be IRO's alone, or the agency's alone. In numerous instances the agency had contributed this service to the IRO <sup>DP program</sup> throughout the first two and a half years of the operations without IRO support other than the standard logistical support provided in certain areas. In those years it was habitual to call them "supplementary" programs. In later years, as one agency after another reached the point of budget exhaustion, a number of these projects were continued with financial grants from IRO because its program would have suffered severely without them. By this time they were less "supplementary" and more "basic" in the IRO vocabulary.

#### Hard Core Grants

19. Some \$4,991,092 was expended by IRO through voluntary agencies on behalf of "hard core" cases" needing special care. Resettlement and continuing care for as long as necessary - frequently lifetime care - was the obligation assumed by the agency in comparison with which the IRO scale of grants ranging from \$500 for aged and others up to the maximum of \$1,000 for a TB case was more in the nature of a supplementary contribution. It is estimated that at least

1/ By the close of the camping season in 1949 the YMCA/YWCA had given 750,000 camping days in 4 years to 50,000 DP children in the U.S. Zone of Germany. Similar activities were conducted in other Zones of Germany and in Austria where the "Y" also organized a very successful old people's summer camp one year.

- 3 -

7,700 persons requiring remedial treatment or special care plus family members were provided for as to resettlement and future care with the aid of these grants, a total of possibly 20,000 persons or more including family members whose resettlement was blocked without provision for the handicapped family member.

20. It should be noted that most of the grants making up this total of some \$4,991,092 were made in the last year of IRO operations. They do not include the case grants paid by IRO for numerous persons placed through arrangements with governments, although the institutions were, in many instances, operated by voluntary societies. Nor do they include all individual persons placed one by one with voluntary institutions where individual claims for grants were made upon arrival of a certified case in the resettlement country. The grants making up the present total were mainly for group projects for which an agency assumed final responsibility. The ~~projects~~ for physically handicapped cases resettled in the U.S. (mentioned under the U.S. program above) and ~~other~~ other cases requiring institutional care were placed well before IRO operations ended. But others among these projects reflected IRO's transfer of responsibility in 1951 for the future resettlement of specified numbers of remaining hard core cases, to several of the principal agencies already committed deeply to the same objective. These transfers occurred at the time when IRO could no longer continue the case by case resettlement negotiations it had previously maintained for its hard core program, and it also became manifest that some of these cases could not be disposed of before the end of IRO operations. Among some religious or ethnic groups substantial numbers were provided for, even if not always in a completely satisfactory manner, by placement in institutions in the local economy where they were. Among other groups there was no permanent solution of this kind and the residual responsibility for removal to other asylum was thus greater.

21. These hard core projects included a global settlement with AJDC for all remaining Jewish hard core cases (estimated at 4,000) in all IRO fields of operation, including China, with a grant of \$3,000,000. A smaller global settlement for several hundred hard core and rehabilitation cases, with a high proportion of TB's, was made with the American National Committee to Aid Homeless Armenians, for \$250,000. This disposed of all remaining Armenian cases of whom a number would be placed in the Lebanon. NCWC received \$353,600, LWF \$115,800 and WCC \$350,000 with the object of providing for 1,500 to 1,600 cases from Germany, Austria and Italy where these same agencies and their counterparts were also assisting with local settlement and care. WCC received \$357,000 of which an appropriate part was for hard core cases, to assist when the agency accepted the entire responsibility for IRO's small residual group in the Philippines. This grant covered three items - hard core grants for these remaining 100 or so cases which Philippine authorities refused to allow to remain even at outside expense; care and maintenance in the Philippines pending their removal; and the estimated costs of movement to countries of final asylum (mainly in Europe). Happily, WCC is now down to its last handful in this most difficult of liquidation programs, but has already had its small camp on Samar destroyed three times by typhoons.

#### Logistical Support to Field Programs

22. In its four and a half years of operations IRO provided logistical support in Germany, Austria and Italy to voluntary programs for which IRO itself stood as official sponsor and coordinator vis a vis governing authorities. In the main (in Germany and Austria) these subsidies were limited to field programs in areas where normal civilian facilities did not exist. The estimated value of this support provided from IRO's funds totalled \$3,468,383 (an estimate, not an exact figure); in addition, IRO shared with its agencies the facilities of the occupation DM budget available to its program in Germany to an estimated value of \$7,953,174 (also an estimate based on cost factors which can only be approximately assessed). As will

- 9 -

be seen from the table, the support from IRO funds diminished substantially in the last two years. The somewhat higher figures in the DM budget in this latter period are accounted for by substantial subsidies (through the principal international agencies) to the national German agencies which bore the chief burdens of the programs to aid residual groups following June 1950. Each of them provided several hundred caseworkers and other staff especially assigned to this program and made a notable contribution to the subsequent resettlement as well as the local integration of residual DPs.

23. IRO had almost 1,500 voluntary agency personnel officially attached to its field organization for special facilities in these areas when PCIRO operations commenced. They operated some 800 vehicles. On the termination date of 31 January 1952 there were 283 attached personnel and 447 vehicles (many operated by "unattached" local employees). The status and special facilities for the attached personnel (and also vehicles, installations etc.) of voluntary agencies depended upon their attachment to IRO. To a proportion of these field workers IRO provided total or partial subsistence allowances (the cost of daily subsistence only). The agencies employed many field staff who served as volunteers without salary or at very nominal rates of pay. Some non-American agencies also lacked the necessary currencies to operate in U.S. occupied areas where their services were urgently needed. For those receiving less than IRO compensation to the lowest grades of its own employees subsistence allowances were provided if their assignments were for IRO-supported activities. A sliding scale of partial subsistence was provided for a further small range above this minimum figure, according to cost factors which varied from area to area and from year to year. Above this level, persons receiving adequate salaries for maintenance received no subsidy. Thus, in December 1950 IRO had 650 attached agency personnel of whom 332 were supported. In December 1951, 420 were attached, of whom only 131 were supported. Similarly, vehicles, within approved limits, received POL rations or allowances and running repairs. In December 1951, of the 447 vehicles attached, 315 were supported. In some areas (Austria) some assistance was given in rental of office accommodation or physical installations. A certain amount of duty travel within the areas was also provided for staff. Local (unattached) staff received salary or subsistence allowances within approved limits from the DM occupational budget in Germany. Little assistance could be given for local staff in the other areas and these were provided for from the agencies' private budgets.

#### Conclusion

24. If we omit the big reimbursement factor for shipping executed by agencies (chiefly to Israel) which took place mainly in the two middle years, it will be seen from the summary table that IRO expenditures on behalf of refugees, through voluntary agencies, was concentrated substantially in the final 18 months. This was the time of drastic and successive reductions in the IRO program and field organization. This process was not infrequently expedited by farming out many field services to agencies - especially if their geographical location or the type of skill required was geographically remote for the strategic consolidation of IRO staff, or functionally no longer within the technical scope of IRO supervising specialists. This period saw, simultaneously, the extension of the U.S. DP Act and the expansion of its program when agency budgets were nearing exhaustion. Finally, it was the time when IRO and agencies alike had to face up to the problem of the hard core, the residuals and all the borderlines of those problems and make a concentrated effort to resolve them or reduce them to minimum proportions.

25. Throughout the IRO program the DP refugee population had the same needs for the full range of community social, health, recreational, educational, cultural and religious services that the population of any country normally requires - plus something more, from the facts that they were refugees and had to be moved (most of them) from where they were if possible. In the areas of main concentration they received from local public and voluntary sources no part of those normal services that any population requires, until

- 10 -

very late in the program. IRO's budget or program could by no means provide for such total population needs, nor could all the associated agencies completely fill this gap. However, apart from the special assignments described in this paper the many-sided programs of these agencies that were generally described as "supplementary", as "welfare", "personal services", "relief programs", "community activities" or by other noms de plume, were in the main an attempt to fill this gap insofar as their resources and the constant emergency calls would permit. Their voluntary presence in the field (a visible evidence of private initiative and concern) had an immense effect on the morale of the refugees, and the visible needs confronting them in the field in turn fed the fires which stirred helping groups into action elsewhere. This kept supplementary material aid flowing into the camps and thousands of resettlers flowing out to their newly found sponsors overseas.

13 January 1953

Revision I

DRAFT FOR AGREEMENT LETTER  
IRO TRUST FUND - CHINA

- (1) This will confirm the agreement reached between the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration and X concerning a co-operative programme for the resettlement of European refugees from China who were formerly registered with the International Refugee Organization or who, prima facie, would have been within the mandate of IRO.
- (2) The terms of this agreement shall be, in all particulars, subject to the principles and conditions of the agreement between IRO and the Migration Committee relating to the establishment of a Trust Fund for the Movement of Refugees, which is attached to, and constitutes a part of, this agreement. It shall be applied retroactively to all refugees resettled from China through the co-operative action of the Migration Committee and X in the year 1952, who have been accepted by the Committee for assistance from funds contributed by IRO and administered by the Committee. It shall also be subject to any agreements or regulations in force, or to be established hereafter, which govern the conditions of the Committee's operations in China on behalf of refugees to whom this agreement applies.
- (3) X agrees to assist the Committee in the permanent resettlement in other countries of refugees from China to which this agreement applies, such assistance to include as required, such services, other than those provided by the Committee, which are necessary to the procurement of resettlement opportunities, and for the selection, sponsorship, processing, reception, placement and firm resettlement of these refugees. In addition, X will assist the Committee, as provided in paragraph (5) below, in the execution of loans to these refugee migrants for passage and other costs incidental to their movement, and will make its best efforts to collect repayments on these loans to be returned to the Committee in its capacity as Trustee for the IRO Trust Fund for the Movement of Refugees and for the special trust fund contributed by IRO for the movement of IRO refugees from China.
- (4) Upon the request of X the Committee will provide or arrange for the call forward to Hongkong of refugees for whom resettlement opportunities have been procured by X, assist with processing services and provide or arrange as required, for the transportation of these refugees to the port of Hongkong and subsequently to their final destination in the country of resettlement.
- (5) X will assist the Committee to obtain prepayment of a part or all of the costs of such movements when the assisted refugees or their sponsors are in a position to make such prepayments. For the balance of the passage and other costs incidental to the movement, X will obtain from the migrant or his sponsor a promissory note for the repayment of these costs to X, it being understood that the financial assistance provided from IRO trust funds for these movements is provided as a loan on which the repayments will be returned to the Trust Fund for the Movement of Refugees to provide similar assistance to other eligible refugees. X, with the aid of its associated agencies in the countries of resettlement, will make its best efforts to collect the repayments on these loans to be returned to the Committee as Trustee. The funds so collected shall be held for the Committee in the accounts of X in the countries in which the collections are made, to be repaid to the Committee by X at intervals, or otherwise utilized for the purposes of the Trust, as the Committee shall from time to time direct.
- (6) In those instances in which X or its affiliated agencies find it to be necessary to provide additional loans from their own funds to these refugees/migrants for costs incidental to their movement, reception and assistance pending placement at their final destination, it is agreed that X or its associated agencies may add such amounts to the promissory notes obtained from the refugees or their sponsors, and that X and its associated agencies will retain the repayments on the amount of such loans advanced from their own funds. The repayments of such loans advanced from agency funds shall be a first charge against the collections obtained by X or its associated agencies in repayments on the total amount of the loans entered in the promissory notes.

- 2 -

- (7) X will provide reports to the Committee in the substance and frequency required by the Committee in its capacity as Trustee for the IRO Trust Fund for the Movement of Refugees. These reports shall include information and observations on the projects undertaken by X and associated agencies to aid in the resettlement of refugees to which this agreement applies, and reports on the status of loans and collections on these loans for which funds have been advanced from IRO trust funds. The manner in which these obligations are to be fulfilled will be defined in a written procedure to be agreed upon between the Committee and X.
- (8) The Committee will provide to X at intervals a grant of funds from the IRO Trust Fund for the Movement of Refugees estimated as a small per capita allowance based on the number of persons actually resettled to whom this agreement applies. The purpose of these grants will be to assist X with a modest contribution toward costs of services, reception and placement essential to the resettlement of those persons, other than those items on which costs can be recovered in repayments of movement loans, and toward the administrative requirements of X for the operation of this program. The amount of such grants and the per capita rates on which they may be based for any specified project or period of time shall be determined by the Committee following consultation with X, and notified to X in writing.
- (9) Subject to such examination as the Committee may deem to be necessary, it shall be the responsibility of X to determine the eligibility of refugees for assistance within the terms of this agreement, whether as refugees formerly registered with IRO or as persons who, prima facie, would have been eligible for assistance from that Organization. The Committee will provide to X a guide as to eligible and ineligible categories of refugees upon which X will base its determinations as to individual cases.
- (10) This agreement will become effective upon our receipt of your written acceptance of the understanding set forth in this letter. It will be retroactive to 1 February 1952 and will remain in effect until its termination. It may be extended or terminated at any time by mutual consent of the parties given in writing, or it may be terminated at any time on one month's notice from either party to the other on the understanding that the respective obligations of the parties shall be fully acquitted prior to the date of such termination.

SECRET - 23 January 1953

ESTIMATE OF GRANTS AND PAYMENTS TO VOLUNTARY AGENCIES FROM IRO FUNDS, AND FROM FACILITIES MADE AVAILABLE TO THEM FROM OTHER SOURCES, THROUGH IRO, (OCCUPATIONAL BUDGET IN GERMANY).

TABLE I

PERIOD	LOGISTICAL SUPPORT	DM BUDGET	SPECIAL PROJECTS	REIMBURSEMENT FOR BASIC IRO PROGRAMS	HARD CORE	REFUGEE SERVICE COMMITTEES	GRAND TOTAL
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1947/48	1,000,000	1,720,635	-	972,500	-	-	3,693,135
1948/49	1,021,509	1,720,635	184,062	14,058,662	-	-	16,984,868
1949/50	794,755	1,892,857	420,637	4,740,299	-	280,000	8,128,548
July 50-Dec. 51	652,119	2,619,047	2,511,271	1,942,396	4,991,092	100,000	12,315,925
TOTAL	3,468,383	7,953,174	3,115,970	21,713,857	4,991,092	380,000	41,622,476

NOTES

The figures for the 18 months period July 1950 - December 1951 include certain items for which actual payment was delayed until after the closure of operations on 31 January 1952.

The estimates in Column 3 were not a charge on IRO funds. This assistance came from the occupational budget in Germany.

<sup>1/</sup> Delayed allotments from Blocked D.M. Account, final payments on some projects or reimbursements, some logistical support beyond December.

January 1953

BREAKDOWN OF GRANTS, PAYMENTS AND  
LOGISTICAL SUPPORT GIVEN OR MADE  
AVAILABLE TO VOLUNTARY AGENCIES BY  
IRO

JDC Archives  
AR 45/64  
#3840

FISCAL YEAR 1947/48

LOGISTICAL SUPPORT

- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Dollar Budget - German, Austria, Italy | \$1,000,000 |
| 2. Deutschmark Budget - Germany           | 1,720,635   |

SPECIAL PROJECTS

N11

REIMBURSEMENT OF BASIC  
IRO PROGRAMS

972,500

Movements

- |                              |                |
|------------------------------|----------------|
| 3. AJDC Individual Movements | 772,500        |
| 4. HIAS " "                  | 200,000        |
|                              | <u>972,500</u> |

HARD CORE GRANTS

N11

TOTAL

\$3,693,135

BREAKDOWN OF GRANTS, PAYMENTS AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT GIVEN OR MADE AVAILABLE TO VOLUNTARY AGENCIES BY IRO

FISCAL YEAR 1948/49

LOGISTICAL SUPPORT

- |    |   |             |
|----|---|-------------|
| 1. | Dollar Budget - Germany, Austria, Italy | \$1,021,509 |
| 2. | Deutschmark Budget, Germany             | 1,720,635   |

SPECIAL PROJECTS

184,062

- |                |                                |          |
|----------------|--------------------------------|----------|
| <u>Austria</u> |                                |          |
| 3.             | ORT Language and Voc. Training | \$30,000 |

- |              |                                 |                |
|--------------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| <u>Italy</u> |                                 |                |
| 4.           | ORT/AJDC Rehab. & Voc. Training | 154,062        |
|              |                                 | <u>184,062</u> |

REIMBURSEMENT OF BASIC IRO PROGRAMS

14,058,662

- |                  |                           |                |
|------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| <u>Movements</u> |                           |                |
| 5.               | AJDC Individual Movements | \$1,402,963    |
| 6.               | AJDC/JAFP (Israel)        | 9,000,000      |
| 7.               | HIAS Individual Movements | <u>518,077</u> |
|                  |                           | 10,921,040     |

- |   |             |              |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| <u>Vocational Training (local agencies)</u> |             |              |
| 8.  | Belgium     | 6,943        |
| 9.  | France      | 113,257      |
| 10.   | Netherlands | <u>3,643</u> |
|   |             | 123,843      |

- |   |             |              |
|---|-------------|--------------|
| <u>Cash Relief (C and M) to Refugees (through local agencies)</u> |             |              |
| 11.   | Belgium     | 431,289      |
| 12.   | France      | 2,299,330    |
| 13.   | Netherlands | 22,339       |
| 14.   | Portugal    | 97,863       |
| 15.   | Spain       | 153,956      |
| 16.   | Luxembourg  | <u>9,002</u> |
|   |             | 3,013,779    |

HARD CORE GRANTS

Nil

TOTAL

\$16,984,868