

DOCUMENTS
INDEX UNIT

COMMITTEE ON JERUSALEM

19 DEC 1950

M

RESTRICTED
Com. Jer/SR/2*

3 March 1949.

SUMMARY RECORD OF SECOND MEETING
held in Jerusalem on 3 March at 11 a.m.

Present: Mr. Halderman (U.S.A.) - Chairman
M. Benoit (France)
Mr. Eralp (Turkey)
Mr. Azcarate - Principal Secretary

I. Chairmanship of Committee

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Committee that at its preliminary meeting on 10 February it had decided that the chairmanship should rotate among members on a two weekly basis. He asked the Committee whether, in view of the fact that he had held office since 10 February, he should not now be replaced.

The Committee decided to ask the United States representative to continue in office as chairman for the ensuing two weeks, in view of the fact that the Committee had not met since 10 February. Further, whereas the representatives of France and Turkey on the Conciliation Commission would be absent from Jerusalem during the ensuing period, the representative of the United States would be available for consultation, should the occasion arise.

II. Plan of Work

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion by stating that in his view the Committee's goal was to devise a scheme that would be both acceptable to the two parties and satisfactory in itself. The Committee had therefore three practical tasks before it: (a) to consult with the interested parties; (b) to work out a scheme which the Committee itself could approve; (c) to attempt to reconcile the Committee's scheme with the aspirations of the two parties concerned.

* No summary record was issued of the Committee's first meeting on 10 February 1949.

The ensuing discussion centered chiefly round the following points: the question whether the Committee should first ascertain the views of the parties as to what would be acceptable to them, and later draw up a scheme, or whether it would be wiser to first draw up an outline scheme and then refer it to the parties concerned; the question whether the consultations should be limited to practical issues, since the political views of the two sides were already known to the Committee, or whether on the other hand it would prove impossible to separate practical from political issues; and the fact that although Israel and Transjordan must be considered the two most interested parties, strong opposition to King Abdullah was felt by a section of the Palestine Arabs, whose views should also be taken into account by the Committee.

On the basis of this discussion, the Committee made the following decisions:-

- (1) to proceed immediately with the consideration of a scheme for Jerusalem, taking as basis for discussion the Working Paper prepared by the Chairman and circulated to the Committee (Com.Jer/W.1);
- (2) to ascertain from the Israeli and Transjordan liaison officers in Jerusalem whether the liaison officers to the Committee on Jerusalem had already been designated;
- (3) to pay formal calls, as a gesture of courtesy and as a preliminary means of contact, on the principal religious and civil authorities in Jerusalem;
- (4) to ask the Legal Adviser to prepare a paper on consular representation in international cities and related questions;
- (5) to postpone for the time being consideration of the question whether or not the Committee should continue to work in Jerusalem during the Conference of Arab States opening in Beirut on 21 March.

III. Procedural Matters

The Committee decided that for the time being it would dispense with interpretations and translations into French of current documents and that its summary records should be brief. It was agreed that these matters could be reconsidered at any time.
