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INTRODUCTION

3. The first was an anonymous reader’s comment on my dissertation, and the second was an anonymous reviewer’s comment to an early draft of what became my article, “Conflicts of Quarantine: The Case of Jewish Immigrants to the Jewish State,” American Journal of Public Health 102, no. 2 (2012): 243–252.
5. Yishuv is the term used to refer to the Jewish community in Palestine prior to the establishment of the state of Israel. Its use also appears in reference to the Jew- ish community in Israel in the state’s early years.
6. Though the question of regulating the scope and makeup of the immigration was being discussed both by policy makers and the public as early as the fall of 1948, during the initial years of statehood, a definitive selection policy was not implemented. Dvora Hacohen explains that decisions by the Jewish Agency to
regulate immigration came in early 1949. Avi Picard has documented how, following years of discussion and debate, a selective immigration policy was finally implemented in November 1951. Picard clarifies that this policy was considered a temporary arrangement until the state could be stabilized, and Hacohen emphasizes that this policy was always conditional to there being no danger to the Jews in their country of origin. If Jews were endangered in the countries they were living in, the selection policy was invalid. Thus the debate came down to determining whether a community was indeed in danger and in need of being rescued. Avi Picard, Yishay Arnon, and Haim Malka have shown that the repercussions of these decisions were occasionally disastrous, particularly in the case of Morocco and communist Europe. But even as the regulation policy kept many people out, and the rate of immigration plateaued, the numbers of immigrants continued to be substantial. Moshe Lissak’s figures show that in the years 1952–1956, more than eighty thousand immigrants moved to Israel.

7. As is widely discussed, the first scholars to study the mass immigration were Israeli sociologists. Dvora Hacohen’s early work *Immigrants in Turmoil* was a watershed moment where historians of Israel began to see the mass immigration as a topic worthy of careful historical reflection and the post-1948 immigrants themselves as important agents within the Israeli landscape whose particular experiences needed to be understood through archival research. Of course, it also makes sense that historical studies did not begin until this point because enough time had to pass to allow for historical reflection and the opening of archives. Some of the important scholars whose historical studies followed closely after, or were contemporaneous to Hacohen, are Tzvi Tzameret, Yaron Tzur, Mordechai Naor, and Dalia Ofer.

8. Avi Picard’s illuminating *Cut to Measure* focuses on North African immigrants, particularly those from Morocco and Tunisia. Esther Meir and, more recently, Orit Bashkin have written invaluable studies on the experiences of immigrants from Iraq; in his study of Argentinian immigration, Sebastian Klor shows the value of looking at the immigrants who arrived to Israel in smaller numbers; Hanna Yablonka’s groundbreaking work came earlier. Yablonka’s focus has been on the integration of Holocaust survivors in Israeli society; the anthology of works by Egyptian-Israeli author Jacqueline Kahanoff adds to our understanding of the immigration of Egyptian Jews to Israel.

9. Shifra Shvarts is the preeminent scholar on the history of medicine in Israel. Her numerous studies have fundamentally changed the way we understand the Israeli health care system. Sachlav Stoler-Liss continued in Shvarts’ path, with her important scholarship on health promotion and health education during the
mass immigration. Nadav Davidovitch has become a unique and commanding voice in this field, consistently and persuasively questioning systems of power and medical hegemony. Rakefet Zalashik has written the preeminent study on the history of psychiatry in Israel. Historian Ari Barell’s important study on the role of science and technology in Israeli nation-building has led to his fascinating new research on Israel’s Iron Dome antirocket technology. Nurit Kirsch’s important work on genetics straddles both the history of medicine and the history of science. Orit Rozin’s work has introduced the social historian’s discipline to the study of mass immigration. Anat Helman’s study of everyday life in 1950s Israel offers an exciting new take on the culture into which the new immigrants arrived.

10. Two recent publications that do an exemplary job overcoming a simplistic Ashkenazi/Mizrahi discourse are Orit Bashkin’s Impossible Exodus and Avi Picard’s Cut to Measure. Picard unearthed sources that carefully document the details surrounding Israel’s selective immigration policy from the end of 1951—a policy that had disastrous repercussions for immigrants from North Africa. He places them within a broad historical context that defies any possibilities for a reductive perception of the Mizrahi or Ashkenazi experience. The result is an illuminating and erudite historiography. Bashkin has made the immigrant’s own experience central to her research. One of the many important contributions of this exceptional book are the sections where the author examines the creation of the Mizrahi identity, asking what exactly this identity is and how it developed within the Israeli experience for post-1948 immigrants.

11. Orit Bashkin, Impossible Exodus: Iraqi Jews in Israel (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2017), 13. This approach of breaking the larger frame of Mizrahi and, similarly, Ashkenazi to examine the particular experiences of distinct immigrant groups could provide a useful entry for additional inquiries into Shaar Ha’aliya.

12. Ibid., 182.

13. Ibid., 212.

14. “Mizrahi solidarity in Israel was forged in the transit camps, schools, kibbutzim, and the Israeli labor market, and grew stronger through the protesting of the state’s policies” (ibid., 209).

15. For example, immigrant camps, labor camps, and transit camps, or ma’abarat. See Lissak, Mass Immigration in the Fifties; Rozin, A Home for All Jews; Hacohen, Immigrants in Turmoil.

### Immigrants to Israel and Shaar Ha’aliya, 1948–1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Israel</th>
<th>Shaar Ha’aliya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>101,819</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>239,076</td>
<td>97,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>169,495</td>
<td>127,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>173,901</td>
<td>99,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>23,375</td>
<td>14,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>10,317</td>
<td>6,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>17,471</td>
<td>5,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>36,758</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>55,494</td>
<td>No numbers available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>69,611</td>
<td>No numbers available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


17. Reports from the World Health Organization (WHO) epidemiological radio bulletin transmissions were received at the Lod air terminal and transmitted to the quarantine stations. Theodor Grushka, *Health Services in Israel* (Jerusalem: Ministry of Health, 1968), 110.


20. Grushka, *Health Services in Israel*, 110. “Body lice, which were occasionally found on immigrants during the period of mass immigration . . . have not been reported in recent years” (39).

21. Ibid., 39.

Edwin Mellen, 1996), 443. Grushka writes that quarantinable diseases were “not endemic in Israel, and the usual internationally accepted procedures are adopted to prevent their introduction” (Grushka, Health Services in Israel, 39).


24. Levy, History of Medicine, 515.


26. “Cutting across modernity’s pluralities, however, are three key characteristics of enforced isolation in the modern era: the flexibility of rationales for segregation or confinement, which often move seamlessly between punishment, protection and prevention; the careful consideration of isolation’s architectural and spatial dimensions; and the subjectification of the isolated, both the official project of modern exclusion and a crucible for the cultivation of selfhood” (Carolyn Strange and Alison Bashford, eds., Isolation: Places and Practices of Exclusion [London: Routledge, 2003], 2).


29. Ibid.

CHAPTER 1 — CONFINES


3. For the article that announced the beginning of the “New Historians,” their revisions of contemporary understanding of the 1948 war, and an outline of the


6. Israel’s establishment occurred at a time in history that had left thousands of Jews needing refuge, with the dismantling of the displaced persons (DP) camps in Europe, the rise of Arab nationalism, the contraction of European colonial power, and the escalation of the Israeli-Arab conflict throughout the Middle East. (On the deterioration of life for Jews in Arab lands, see Hacohen, Immigrants in Turmoil, 3. On the rise of Arab nationalism and contraction of European colonial power on a global scale, see David Thompson, Europe since Napoleon [London: Penguin Books, 1990], 866–875; Todd Shepherd, The Invention of Decolonization: The Algerian War and the Remaking of France [Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006]). All these factors, taking place in the backdrop of the exhilaration and expectation among world Jewry surrounding the establishment of a Jewish state, played a part in the massive influx of Jewish immigrants to Israel following 1948. See Dvora Hacohen, “Medinut ha-aliyah ba-asor ha-rishon la-medina: Ha-nisyonot le-hagbalat ha-aliyah ve-goralam” [Immigration policy in the first decade of statehood: The attempts to restrict immigration and their outcome], in Kibbutz galuyot: Ha-aliyah le-Eretz Yisrael, mitos u-metziz’ut [Ingathering of exiles: Aliyah to the Land of Israel, myth and reality], ed. Dvora Hacohen (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1998), 291.


8. Ibid., 5.


10. Ibid.


12. Defining the terms native and immigrant is a challenge when used in the context of Israeli Jews, particularly in this period. Dalia Ofer addresses the subjectivity
of this concept where people who had arrived in 1946–1947 were considered “veterans,” whereas those who came after 1948 were “immigrants” (Dalia Ofer, ed., Israel in the Great Wave of Immigration, 1948–1953 [in Hebrew] [Jerusalem: Yad Yitzhak Ben Tzvi, 1996]).

13. Hacohen, “Mediniyut ha-aliyah ba-asor ha-rishon la-medinah,” 285. This ideal was expressed in the 1950 law of return: “Every Jew has the right to come to this country as an oleḥ.” The text of the law of return can be found at http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org.


Helman focuses on humor in the Yishuv and Bashkin focuses on humor found among Iraqi immigrants in the transit camps. Bashkin describes this as the immigrants using “one of the oldest mechanisms in the Jewish historical arsenal for dealing with difficult and absurd situations: their sense of humor” (Bashkin, Impossible Exodus, 30).

27. Mordechai Naor explains that there were four types of transit camps (ma’abarot):

1. Urban: These were closer to cities, where most of the immigrants then worked.
2. Mixed: In these cases, people either worked in cities or in agriculture.
3. Agricultural: The immigrants worked mostly in farming.
4. Independent: These ma’abarot were intended from the start to develop into cities, such as Yeruham or Kiryat Shmona.

29. Moshe Lissak’s breakdown of Israeli settlement policy for immigrants during the mass immigration is as follows:

1. May 1948–mid 1950: Immigrant camps

Ibid., 24.
30. Ibid., 32.
31. Like in the case of Shaar Ha’aliya, there is—to date—no public, state remembrance of the transit camps (maabarot) although there has been, for a long time, some discussion of opening a ma’abara museum. The classic literary works that first captured the hardships of life in the transit camps are the works of Shimon Balas (The Maabara, 1964), Sami Michael (Shavim ve Shavim Yoter, 1974), and Eli Amir. Orit Bashkin’s Impossible Exodus is a recent publication that—vividly and
in careful detail—portrays the extreme difficulty of life in the transit camps. See Bashkin, *Impossible Exodus*.

32. Zeev Tzahor, “Ben-Gurion’s Attitude toward the Gola (Diaspora) and Aliyah,” in *Kibbutz galuyot: Ha-aliyah le-Eretz Yisrael, mitos u-metz’ut* [Ingathering of exiles: Aliyah to the Land of Israel, myth and reality], ed. Dvora Hacohen (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1998), 132.

33. George L. Mosse explains, “Nordau constantly used the phrase ‘recapturing the dignity of the Jew’ in his Zionist writings. This meant creating, as Nordau put it, deep-chested, powerfully built and keen-eyed men. A new type of Jew must be created who could end the threat of decadence among the Jews. The new Jew who would emerge from the wreckage of the diaspora symbolized the regeneration of the Jewish people” (George L. Mosse, “Max Nordau, Liberalism and the New Jew,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 27, no. 4 [October 1992]: 567).


39. European Christian Mission Hospitals first opened in 1838. These hospitals gave free treatment that still came at a cost to the Muslim and Jewish patients: while receiving treatment, they were forced to listen to teachings from the Christian gospel. And then—largely in response to, and out of fear from, the Christian medical proselytization—the local Jewish community finally accepted an offer from the philanthropist Moshe Montefiore to open a Jewish clinic with a Jewish doctor in 1854. Headed by Dr. Shimon Frankel, a German-Jewish doctor who was closely tied to ultra-Orthodox Haredi Jews, this was the first Jewish clinic that opened in Jerusalem, in 1854. Then from 1854 to 1902, five Jewish hospitals opened in Jerusalem, mostly as a result of conflicts in the different Jewish communities and the desire to have a hospital that better responded to the needs of the particular communities. These hospitals were Rothschild, Bikur Holim, Misgav Ledach, Shaarei Tzedek, and Ezrat Nashim. For the history of the first Jewish doctors and hospitals in Jerusalem, see Shifra Shvarts, “Hospital Wars” [in Hebrew], Et Mol 27, no. 2 (2001/2). On the history of Palestinian health care, see Nira Reiss, The Health Care of the Arabs in Israel (Westview Special Studies on the Middle East) (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1991); Sandra Sufian, “Arab Health Care during the British Mandate, 1920–1947,” in Separate and Cooperate, Cooperate and Separate: The Disengagement of the Palestine Health Care System from Israel and Its Emergence as an Independent System, ed. Tamara Barnea and Rafiq Hussein (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2002), 9–31.

40. Linat Tzedek is a tradition of nighttime watch over the ill to ensure that they are not alone, while bikur holim is the charitable act of visiting the ill. To understand how these traditions were incorporated in Jewish health care in Palestine, see Shvarts, The Workers’ Health Fund.

41. These physicians took the place previously held by traditional healers. Later, in what is known as the “fifth Aliya,” numerous German physicians settled in the Jewish Yishuv in Palestine, thus significantly contributing to the persistence of European-trained health care workers. See Shvarts, “Hospital Wars.”


44. Weiss, *The Chosen Body*.


49. CZA, AK 456/4, “Introduction” from Report on Shaar Ha’aliya, 10.8.52.

50. There was a section for the statistical department, Kupat Holim, and a general comments section for the use of the camp administration. CZA, AK 456/2, Administrative Report #7, 30.4.50.

51. CZA, AK 456/5.

52. CZA, AK 456/3, Administrative Report #19, 20.2.51; CZA, AK 456/3, Administrative Report #24, 30.4.51.

53. CZA, AK 456/8, Memories of Shaar Ha’aliya Written by Reznik, after March 1962; CZA, AK 456/3, Administrative Report #19, 20.2.51; CZA, AK 456/2, Exchange of Letters of Complaint and Weisberger’s Response, 8.50.

54. CZA, AK 456/5, “Personal Equipment Card” and “Temporary Card.”

55. Although the procedure was occasionally adjusted over the years, the main components of the processing system appear to have been constant: (1) reception and registration, (2) finding and settling into accommodations in the camp, (3) medical examinations, (4) customs declarations, (5) army arrangements, and (6) final housing assignments. These were the bureaucratic stages that had to be completed before the new immigrants were free to leave the camp for their permanent lodgings throughout the country (CZA, AK 456/5, “Tor Habikoret”).
56. “Behitarvut hamishtara yatzu keh-2000 olim le ma’abarot” [2,000 Olim left for ma’abarot with police intervention], Maariv, August 8, 1951; “Bekoach mishtara maavirim olim meh Shaar Ha’aliya leh ma’abarot” [Olim are being transferred from Shaar Ha’aliya to ma’abarot through police force], Al Hamishmar, August 8, 1951.


58. The person’s cabin or tent number was recorded on their personal camp card, but there were still cases of people getting lost and of being unable to identify or find the tent or cabin they had been assigned. CZA, AK 456/8, Memories of Shaar Ha’aliya Written by Reznik, after March 1962.

59. “Ehad hamakeer shloshmeot ve hamishim elef” [One who knows 350,000], Amar, 1.4.56.

60. Rhona Seidelman, interview with D., 10.11.05. This interview was conducted as part of a research project directed by Prof. Shifra Shvarts, the Israel Science Foundation, 1217/04.

61. CZA, AK 456/8, Memories of Shaar Ha’aliya Written by Reznik, after March 1962.


63. OHD, (210), 42.

64. CZA, AK 456/6, “Shaar Ha’aliya Facts and Figures,” 1.4.55.

65. CZA, AK 456/1, “Movement of Immigrants through the Shaar Ha’aliya Processing Camp,” 1.10.53–31.3.54.

66. The exact numbers are 77,245 from Iraq; 63,230 from Romania; 46,433 from Poland; 19,673 from Turkey; and 18,303 from Persia. The 69,743 North Africans included communities from Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco. Almost 40,000 families came through Shaar Ha’aliya. There were around 25,000 elderly people above the age of 60. Many others (close to 11,000) were what was listed as “family remnants, [ . . . ] the war’s tragic yield” (CZA, AK 456/6, “Shaar Ha’aliya Facts and Figures,” 1.4.55).

More than 300,000 immigrants to Israel from 1949 to 1954 did not go through Shaar Ha’aliya. This number includes approximately 100,000 people who came before Shaar Ha’aliya opened; 35,422 Yemenite immigrants who arrived in 1949 but did not go through Shaar Ha’aliya; and 22,000 to 42,000 people who went through Shaar Ha’aliya Bet. Of the remaining number, some may have gone to live
with relatives, some may have been sick and immediately hospitalized, and others may have had their own financial resources and simply gone to live on their own accord. Moreover, there were certainly people who simply managed to avoid or flee Shaar Ha’aliya.

67. Theft: Amoni, “Beshaarei Ha’aliya”; CZA, AK 456/8, Memories of Shaar Ha’aliya Written by Reznik, after March 1962. Violence: “Ehad hamakeer shloshmeot ve hamishim elef”; Rhona Seidelman interview with C. C., 15.11.05. This interview was conducted as part of a research project directed by Prof. Shifra Shvarts, the Israel Science Foundation, 1217/04; Prostitution: Israel State Archives (hereafter ISA), 79/42 2295/1–5, Police Report, 17.10.50.

68. CZA, AK 456/2, Administrative Report #7, 30.4.50.

69. CZA, AK 456/5, “Temporary Card”; Rhona Seidelman interview with E. S., 27.9.05; Rhona Seidelman interview with S. S., 27.9.05. These interviews were conducted as part of a research project directed by Prof. Shifra Shvarts, the Israel Science Foundation, 1217/04.

70. CZA, AK 456/3, Report on Employees’ Meals, 5.6.49.


72. On food being unsuited to the various culinary traditions, see CZA, AK 456/1, Letter of Complaint, Dr. Berman, 2.2.51. Complaint about food at Shaar Ha’aliya: CZA, AK 456/1, Letter of Complaint, by J. O. [in English], 7.8.51. On wasted food: Weisberger, Shaar Ha’aliya, 75.

73. The most common explanation for why immigrants would not have left Shaar Ha’aliya was that they objected to the permanent residences they had been assigned by the Jewish Agency. The most common interpretation for why they had not left was that they preferred the sheltered existence in the camp (where they didn’t have to work and were given free food) to subsisting independently outside Shaar Ha’aliya. These are explanations and interpretations given by camp administrators and not the immigrants themselves.

74. CZA, AK 456/2, Administrative Order #7, 30.4.50; CZA, AK 456/3, Administrative Order #44, 24.3.52.


76. Amoni, “Beshaarey Ha’aliya”; CZA, AK 456/1, Letter to Editor by J. O., Jerusalem Post, July 1951; CZA, AK 456/1, Letter of Complaint, 8.50.
77. CZA, AK 456/3, Article on Shaar Ha’aliya in *Jewish Agency Digest*, March 1950. Many of the Shaar Ha’aliya staff members were themselves immigrants, although there are currently no numbers available for exactly how many were immigrants or what their countries of origin were.


79. Weisberger, *Shaar Ha’aliya*, 70.

80. Sick funds (*Kupot Holim*) are Israeli medical insurance organizations. The first sick fund began to operate in Palestine in 1913. It was established by Labor Zionists in response to the medical needs of their communities. By the time the state was established in 1948, there were four such funds in existence. For more on the history of Israel’s sick funds, see Shvarts, *The Workers’ Health Fund*.


82. For a description of the minograph, see Clement F. Batelli, “Youth Interest High in War against Tuberculosis,” *Health* 73, no. 6 (June 1946).

83. ISA, file 4251/23–57/3 1, Report of Immigrant Health Services on Shaar Ha’aliya, 17.4.53.


85. CZA, AK 456/2, Report on Number of Immigrants Who Entered and Left Shaar Ha’aliya, 23.5.56. The attention given to the treatment of trachoma and ringworm, as well as improved hygiene and sanitation, had greatly diminished the incidence of these diseases in the prestate Jewish community in Palestine (*Yishuv*). Zipora Shehory-Rubin and Shifra Shvarts, “‘Hadassah’ le-vri’ut ha-am: P’eluthah ha-bri’ut ha-hinukh shel ‘Hadassah’ be-Eretz Yisrael bi-tkufat ha-mandat ha-briti” [“Hadassah” for the health of the people: The health education work of “Hadassah” in Eretz Israel during the British Mandate] (Jerusalem: Ha-Sifriyah ha-Tziyonit, 2003), 90, 95.

With the mass immigration, the cases of these diseases once again grew in number. The decision to designate a separate area of Shaar Ha’aliya as a ringworm and trachoma institute touched upon some of the state’s most fundamental concerns: immigration, health, and children. According to historian Avi Picard, “the heavy burden on health services, the deterioration of health conditions in Israel due to epidemics and infectious disease, and the dire economic straits led, beginning in 1952, to a policy of selective immigration” (Avi Picard, “Immigration, Health and


89. I discuss this more fully in Seidelman, Troen, and Shvarts, “‘Healing’ the Bodies and Souls.”


91. “When the selective immigration policy and the plans to focus on *aliyah* from North African were approved, the Health Ministry and the Immigration Department reached a new agreement. In exchange for having its people put in charge of overseeing *aliyah* preparations in North Africa, the Ministry allowed a small number of ringworm patients (150 per month) to immigrate and be treated in Israel. A camp for ringworm and trachoma patients was set up at Sha’ar ha-Aliyah” (Seidelman, Troen, and Shvarts, “‘Healing the Bodies and Souls,’” 42).

92. CZA, AK 456/3, Report to Histadrut on Shaar Ha’aliya Activity, 182.55.


94. CZA, AK 456/3, Letter from Dr. Chaim Sheba, 18.12.51.

95. Ibid.

96. CZA, AK 456/3, Report on Ringworm and Trachoma Institute, 8.7.52.

97. The precise number of people treated at the center is not clear. A 1956 document listed 5,487 cases treated for ringworm, as of 1952, and 2,715 for trachoma (CZA, AK 456/2, Report on Number of *Olim* Who Entered and Left Shaar Ha’aliya, 23.5.56). Modan and his coauthors put the number of immigrant children irradiated in Israel for ringworm in 1949–1960 at 17,000 (Modan et al., “Radiation-Induced Head and Neck Tumors,” 277). However, Modan’s figures also include the other smaller treatment centers in Tel Hashomer and Jerusalem while also taking into consideration the years before the Shaar Ha’aliya center opened. An article marking the closing of Shaar Ha’aliya in 1962 reported that 12,000 children had been treated at the ringworm and trachoma institute, but they do not specify how many had been treated for each disease (Rafael Bashan, “Kol Adam Hamishi Baaretz Yashav Kahn” [Every fifth person in the country sat here], *Ma’ariv*, 27.9.62).
February 9, 1962). This figure is supported by the data in a table from the files of Yehuda Weisberger—director of Shaar Ha’aliya from 1949 to 1957—which tracks the number of children who went through the center from 1952 to 1955, listing approximately 8,000 children in these three years alone (CZA, AK 456/3, Handwritten Chart Titled “Ringworm”).

98. CZA, AK 456/3, Report on Ringworm and Trachoma Institute, 8.7.52.
99. CZA, AK 456/2, WIZO Booklet [in English], August 1952.
100. CZA, AK 456/3, Report on Ringworm and Trachoma Institute, 8.7.52.
101. CZA, AK 456/3, Report to Histadrut on Shaar Ha’aliya Activity, 18.8.55; CZA, AK 456/6, Undated Report on Sha’ar ha-Aliyah activity, probably from 1954/55.
102. CZA, AK 456/1, Administrative Order #61, 16.8.53.
103. CZA, AK 456/1, Newspaper Article on Purim in the Ringworm and Trachoma Institute, undated.
105. CZA, AK 456/1, Report on Ringworm and Trachoma Institute, 8.7.52.
106. CZA, AK 456/3, Letter from Dr. Chaim Sheba, 18.12.51.
108. CZA, AK 456/6, Report in Weisberger File.


110. CZA, AK 456/2, WIZO Booklet [in English], 8.52.
111. CZA, AK 456/3, Report on Ringworm and Trachoma Institute, 8.7.52.
112. “The hair was cut down to a level of 0.5 cm. and the scalp was divided into five fields, each being irradiated on one out of five consecutive days. The irradiation was done at three medical centres. . . . A temporary sterile cap was put on for eighteen to twenty-one days. Subsequently a cap of colophonium and wax was put on the head and taken off immediately after the wax had hardened, leading to a complete epilation of the hair. Some of the children were recalled for a second and even third course of treatment because of a relapse” (Modan et al., “Radiation-Induced Head and Neck Tumors,” 277).
113. ISA, file 57/3 4251/23–2, Letter in Response to a Complaint Made by Weisberger, 23.7.56.

114. This text is from the controversial documentary Yaldei ha-gazezet [The Ringworm Children] (see chapter 4). Here, there are in fact three testimonies that are interwoven to create one voice that expresses the similarity of the experience for different people. (English translation taken from movie subtitles.)


116. Rhona Seidelman interview with D. N., October 9, 2005. This interview was conducted as part of a research project directed by Prof. Shifra Shvarts, the Israel Science Foundation, 1217/04.


119. This issue arose in the discussion that followed the screening of the movie Yaldei ha-gazezet [The Ringworm Children] at the Tel Aviv Cinemathèque.

120. Kraut, Silent Travellers, 275–276.


122. The others included a Hadassah clinic in Jerusalem; the Tel Hashomer hospital; a Kupat Holim (Histadrut Sick Fund) clinic in Tel Aviv; a Hadassah clinic on Balfour Street in Tel Aviv; and a treatment center in Tiberias. Arab children were treated for ringworm at Rambam hospital in Haifa and, as of 1956, in Nazareth. Moreover, patients could also seek treatment from private physicians throughout Israel. See Seidelman, Shvarts, and Troen, “‘Healing’ the Bodies and Souls,” 197.

123. CZA, AK 456/3, Report to Histadrut on Shaar Ha’aliya Activity, 18.2.55; CZA, AK 456/6, Undated Report on Shaar Ha’aliya Activity, probably from 1954/55. Although there is evidence to suggest that some Israeli-born children were sent to Shaar Ha’aliya for ringworm treatment (Shifra Shvarts interview with E. F., Israel Science Foundation, 1217/04), these would only have been cases where the parents had immigrated after 1948 and the child was born during the mass immigration. As a result, although the child would have in fact been Israeli-born, he or she would still have been strongly associated with the mass immigration. Children of “old-timers” who had ringworm tended to be treated in various local clinics run by their respective health care funds.

125. On Shaar Ha’aliya Bet, see CZA, AK 456/3, Untitled Document Written after 1954; and CZA, AK 456/1, “Distribution of the Aliya from Ports of Arrival,” 1.4.51–12.8.54. While one document suggests that twenty-two thousand people went through Shaar Ha’aliya Bet (CZA, AK 456/3, Untitled Document from Weisberger’s Files, Written after 1954), another document claims that the figure was actually forty-two thousand (CZA, AK 456/1, “Distribution of the Aliya from Ports of Arrival,” 1.4.51–12.8.54).

126. CZA, AK 456/3, List of Immigrants to Shaar Ha’aliya. See table 1.

127. CZA, AK 456/3, Letter from Mapai Cell in Shaar Ha’aliya to Mapai Office, Tel Aviv, 23.3.51; CZA, AK 456/6, Shaar Ha’aliya “Facts and Figures,” 1.4.55.

128. CZA, AK 456/6, Report on Changes in Shaar Ha’aliya Administration, 18.2.55.

129. Rafael Bashan, “Kol Adam Hamishi Baaretz Yashav Kahn” [Every fifth person in the country sat here], Ma’ariv, February 9, 1962.

CHAPTER 2 — STRUCTURE


2. Leviticus 13:45.
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