UNITED NATIO NS



Distr. RESTRICTED

A/AC.25/SR/PM/8 5 October 1951

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE SUMMARY RECORD OF A MEETING BETWEEN THE CONCILIATION COMMISSION AND THE DELEGATIONS OF ISRAEL Held at the Hotel de Carillon, Paris, On Friday, 5 October 1951, at 11 a.m.

CONTENTS

Draft of non-aggression pact submitted by the Israel delegation ($\underline{IS/70}$)

PRESENT

<u>Chairman</u>: <u>Members</u>:

<u>Alternates</u>:

<u>Secretariat</u>:

<u>Also Present</u>:

Mr. PALMER Mr. MARCHAL Mr. ARAS Mr. BARCO Mr. TEPEDELIN Mr. De AZCARATE Mr. FISCHER United States of America France Turkey United States of America

Principal Secretary Israel

DRAFT ON NON-AGGRESSION PACT SUBMITTED BY THE ISRAEL DELEGATION (15/70)

The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission, having received the communication from the Israel delegation containing a proposal for a non-aggression pact ($\underline{IS/70}$), felt that the latter would probably wish to have an opportunity to explain or comment upon it. The Commission noted that the communication referred to Israel's statement of 21 September, on which occasion her willingness to subscribe to a declaration of the kind made by the Commission was mentioned. Mr. FISCHER (Israel) said that in making its offer of a non-aggression pact, his delegation's primary idea had been to meet the Commission's wishes for a gesture that would create the atmosphere necessary to progress. It had further wished to take some step towards agreement by the parties on a minimum declaration of pacific intentions. He hoped the Commission had interpreted the communication as containing nothing further than that. In his delegation's opinion, the text of the proposed pact might suitably be communicated to the other parties, as a means of affording them the opportunity of manifesting their pacific intentions also. The CHAIRMAN thanked Mr. Fischer for his explanations. The Commission had well understood the communication to be an indication of Israel's preparedness to accept the communication's suggestions, as a form for consideration, particularly as Israel's proposals appeared to go further than the commission's original nonaggression suggestion.Regarding the form of Israel's proposal, the problem seemed to be one of timing. The Commission had sensed from the discussions to date, that the time for a proposal as formal as Israel's draft pact, was after, rather than before, discussion of the Commission's proposals. The formality of Israel's proposal made it difficult for the Commission to submit it to the other parties. However, the important point at the present stage was the manifestation of a desire to create a favourable atmosphere. For that reason, the Commission much appreciated Israel's proposal and her attempt to meet the Commission's wishes. Mr. FISCHER (Israel) wished to make clear that his delegation has no intention of causing difficulties over questions of form. They would be ready to consider amendments of form to the text if necessary. What mattered was the spirit of the offer and, that being so, he thought it could well be submitted to the other parties as an indication of Israel's pacific intentions. The CHAIRMAN thought that a proposal in the form presented by Israel was perhaps premature. However, inasmuch as it wee taken as a manifestation of her willingness submitting it, as such, to the other delegations, on the understanding that, vice versa, it would submit to the Israel delegation any proposals on the subject that the

Arabs might put forward.

Mr. ARAS (Turkey) and Mr. MARCHAL (France) agreed with the Chairman that it was too early to expect the conclusion of a formal pact on the lines suggested by Israel, but were glad to note that in making its proposals that delegation had been prompted by the Commission's own suggestions.

Mr. FISCHER (Israel) expressed the hope that the Commission would submit its proposed pact to the other delegations and inform Israel of their reactions.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.

Document in PDF format

Fr ançais