

UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

GENERAL COMMITTEE

RESTRICTED
COM/GEN/SR.64
9 August 1950
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL:FRENCH

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTY-FOURTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations,
Geneva,
On Friday, 7 July 1950 at 11 a.m.

Present:

Mr. de NICOLAY	(France)	Chairman
Mr. ERALP	(Turkey)	
Mr. BARCO	(United States of America)	
Mr. de AZCARATE		Principal Secretary

1. Press Communiqué

The CHAIRMAN recalled that at its last meeting the Commission had decided to entrust the General Committee with the study of the final draft of a press communiqué to be released before the Commission's departure for Jerusalem. The Committee had before it three drafts, from which it would have to choose.

The PRINCIPAL SECRETARY recalled that at its previous meeting the Commission had studied a draft communiqué prepared by the Secretariat as well as another draft prepared by Mr. Fisher, the Commission's Press Officer in Jerusalem. Following that study, the Commission, considering that both these texts had advantages and disadvantages, had asked the Secretariat to amalgamate into one text the parts of both drafts which it considered worthy of being maintained. Considering, however, the completely different approach

of these two texts, the Secretariat had not been able to evolve, on the basis of the two documents, one sufficiently homogeneous draft. Taking into consideration the conclusions reached by the Commission after an exchange of views on the subject, the Secretariat had therefore prepared a new draft press communique presenting a brief but accurate chronological account of the work of the Commission in Geneva and supplying sufficient elements to enable the readers of the communique to understand the attitude of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the Commission had indeed considered that the initial Secretariat draft, which contained an excellent analysis of the Commission's activities in Geneva, gave an exceedingly detailed account of facts; the draft submitted by Mr. Fisher, on the other hand, was written in a more direct and journalistic form but it had the disadvantage of not explaining sufficiently the reasons and principles which had guided the Commission in its activities. As for the third draft, submitted that day by the Secretariat, it seemed at first sight to fulfill satisfactorily the Commission's wishes.

Mr. ERALP (Turkey) considered that the new Secretariat draft combined the weaknesses of both the other draft communiques. He would have preferred the new version of the communique to be inspired primarily by the first Secretariat draft, while taking into consideration one or two points contained in the text submitted by Mr. Fisher. He did not believe that the Commission should sacrifice substance to drafting.

Mr. BARCO (U.S.A.) thought that the new Secretariat draft was satisfactory: he agreed, however, with Mr. Eralp that it might be possible to improve the last paragraph by deleting everything that had no direct bearing on the facts. He therefore suggested that the new draft be taken as a basis for a text into which it would be possible to insert some passages from the first Secretariat draft.

After an exchange of views, the Committee decided, at the suggestion of Mr. ERALP (Turkey) and Mr. BARCO (U.S.A.) to indicate clearly in the communique that the Commission had to report on the last phase of its work to the Secretary-General of the United Nations or to the fifth session of the General Assembly. The Committee further recognized, as indicated by the CHAIRMAN, that it would be necessary to recall the reasons for which the Commission had chosen to have a session in Geneva and to give the motives for its current decision to go to Jerusalem. He also deemed it essential to mention the Commission's proposals of 29 March 1950 and to indicate that the Commission, far from giving up hope of solving the Palestinian problem, was determined to continue its efforts.

On that basis, the Secretariat immediately proceeded to alter the new draft communique, which was then slightly modified by the Committee, with a view to making the text logical and balanced.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the draft as amended seemed to be fully satisfactory and that it could be submitted to the Commission for approval.

2. Draft Seventh Progress Report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations

The CHAIRMAN reminded the members of the Committee of the changes which had, at the last meeting, been made in the text of the draft report.

Taking up again, paragraph by paragraph, the study of the text as amended, the Committee, after an exchange of views, decided that it would be necessary to alter the last sentence but one of the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 2, so that it should be clearly understood that the Commission had thought it preferable to explain to the parties which principles would guide it in the course of negotiations in Mixed Committees, in the hope of making these proposals acceptable.

Speaking on paragraph 3 which, during the last meeting, had already been the subject of an exchange of views, Mr. ERALP (Turkey)

still thought that the indication of the Arab States' return to their previous stand, while interesting in itself, would be more appropriately given in the final report rather than in a progress report. He thought that it had been decided to delete that paragraph.

The PRINCIPAL SECRETARY remarked that the question arose whether the Commission considered the change of attitude of the Arab States as sufficiently important a fact to warrant a mention in the report. He stressed the fact that, in the study of the development of the situation, which formed the subject of the progress reports, the Commission had always indicated the changes in the positions of the parties.

At the suggestion of Mr. BARCO (U.S.A.) the CHAIRMAN suggested that the sub-paragraph be maintained in the draft report and the Commission's attention be drawn to the matter, so that a decision could be taken on the advisability of maintaining the sub-paragraph.

With regard to paragraph 6, Mr. BARCO (U.S.A.) wondered whether it would not be desirable to delete the last sentence, which said that the general statements made by the Arab States before the Commission would be taken up later.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that the insertion of that sentence, proposed by Mr. de Boisanger, aimed at giving satisfaction to the Arab States, by implying that their statements would be considered at a later date. One should keep in mind, however, the Principal Secretary's remark that the fact of including in the report a mention of the statements made by the Arab States might make it necessary to mention also the memorandum of the Government of Israel, dated 29 March 1950. This point would have to be submitted to the Commission.

The Committee considered that, with these alterations, the report would constitute an excellent analysis of the situation and that it would be possible to submit it to the Commission for approval.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.