



UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE
COMMITTEE ON JERUSALEM
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FOURTEENTH MEETING
held in Beirut on 23 March, 1949

Present:	Mr. Yenisey	(Turkey)	Chairman
	Mr. Benoist	(France)	
	Mr. Halderman	(U.S.A.)	
	Mr. Barnes		Secretary of the Committee

The CHAIRMAN explained that he had called the meeting to consider the future work of the Committee. At its meeting earlier in the day, the Commission had indicated that the Committee should continue its work, and that it was necessary to make certain plans accordingly.

The Committee had already seen three Mayors on the Arab side in the Jerusalem area, as well as the Mayor of the Jewish sector of the City and the official representatives of the Israeli Government. Transjordan had been asked to appoint a representative but had refused to do so. The Transjordanian Prime Minister had told the Chairman that Transjordan would not appoint such a representative, because it did not want to appear to approach the Jerusalem question unilaterally. The Israeli representative, Mr. Comay, had been categorical in his refusal to accept the principle of the [Assembly's resolution](#), and the Israeli position could be summed up by saying that the Jews wanted the New City under their control.

Mr. YENISEY said that Mr. Benoist had suggested that the Committee might talk with representatives of the various confessions in Jerusalem. The Chairman found it difficult, however, to leave the seat of the Commission and would propose that the Jerusalem Committee work wherever the Commission might be, with perhaps occasional trips to Jerusalem for consultation on specific matters.

Mr. HALDERMAN asked for a clarification of Mr. Yenisey's statement about Mr. Comay's position.

Mr. YENISEY replied that, according to his understanding, the Israeli representative had been categorical in holding that the New City should stay under Jewish control. Mr. Yenisey said that, in his opinion, the Committee must remain firm in its insistence on the principle stated in the [resolution](#), and that no concessions on either side were possible. The Jews had refused to agree to internationalization of the entire city and were, therefore, acting in contravention of the [Assembly's mandate](#).

Mr. HALDERMAN said he would like clarification as to whether the Commission had approved, at its morning meeting, the proposed new terms of reference which Mr. Ethridge had submitted.

Mr. YENISEY replied that he did not know whether any decision had been reached, but his understanding was that the principle was not to be modified under any circumstances. It would be impossible even to discuss any proposed modification. Only details of a statute carrying out the exact meaning of the [resolution](#) would be open to discussion.

Mr. BENOIST said it was unnecessary to reach any decision at the meeting. But he said it was clear that the Committee needed clear direction as to its future work. He said he felt the Committee should return to Jerusalem forthwith. He said he shared Mr. Yenisey's attitude that the principle set forth in the resolution could not be contested, but he suggested that it might be possible to find an intermediate solution somewhere between the former Trusteeship Statute and the plan informally put forward by Mr. Halderman.

The CHAIRMAN called attention to the fact that the Committee had been called into meeting for the sole purpose of discussing questions of procedure. He reiterated that it was most difficult for him to leave the seat of the Commission, and asked if members of the Committee agreed to his proposal that the Committee should continue to work wherever the Commission might be.

Mr. BENOIST said that if the Commission decided to return to Jerusalem in four or five days, he would have no objection to remaining in Beirut for that long. If the Commission should decide to stay in Beirut longer, or to go elsewhere, he felt the Committee should return to Jerusalem.

Mr. YENISEY said that, in any event, the Commission could not remain indefinitely in Beirut, and he suggested that the Committee should wait until the Commission returned to Jerusalem. Also, he said, it would be important for him, and perhaps for other Committee members, to be present when the Commission drafted its report. In conclusion, he said it was agreed that the Committee would stay with the Commission if the latter remained in Beirut for more than a week. If the Commission should move elsewhere than Jerusalem, the problem would have to be considered again. He personally would be obliged to stay with the Commission in any event.