UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

RESTRICTED
Com.Jer/W.12
26 March 1949

POSITION OF THE ARAB STATES ON INTERNATIONALIZATION OF JERUSALEM AS INDICATED IN BEIRUT DISCUSSIONS

LEBANON: Subject mentioned only in passing. The Prime Minister remarked that if the reaction of the Arab States to internationalization of the City was negative, it was entirely because of doubts concerning the duration and stability of the regime to be set up.

EGYPT: In response to a direct question from the Chairman, the Foreign Minister said it would seem more reasonable to give Jerusalem to the Arabs, in view of their long record of tolerance. The large number of Jews in the City made such a solution difficult. Egypt would therefore accept the internationalization of the City, in the interests of freedom of worship, but only on condition that there would be guarantees that Jerusalem would remain permanently an international City. The Foreign Minister and the Egyptian Government were fearful that when Arab troops were withdrawn, the City would be seized by the Jews. The United Nations would then say that it had been presented with a fait accompli and would take no action. If satisfactory guarantees were given that the City would remain permanently international and that free access to it would be assured, the Egyptian Government would accept its internationalization wholeheartedly.

/TRANSJORDAN:

TRANSJORDAN: In response to a direct question from the Chairman regarding the appointment of a representative to work with the Jerusalem Committee, the Prime Minister said that the appointment had not been made, first, because Transjordan did not wish to appear to be taking individual action on this question without reference to the other Arab Governments, and second, because cooperation with the Committee might imply that Transjordan accepted the principle of internationalization and was prepared to withdraw her forces from the Jerusalem area. He said this latter step was by no means contemplated at the present juncture.

As regards the general question of Jerusalem, the Prime Minister said there was no unanimous desire on the part of the Arab States to internationalize the City. He understood that Syria and Iraq were strongly opposed, Lebanon was in favour while Egypt was considering the possibility of an internationalized Old City under an Arab mandatory and the New City administered by Israel under United Nations control.

In response to a direct question by Mr. Yalchin as to whether the declaration of the Prime Minister could be interpreted as acceptance of the principle of internationalization, the Prime Minister replied that Transjordan was not opposed to the principle of internationalization provided certain guarantees would be given. Transjordan could not accept internationalization without certainty that the means of carrying it out would be forthcoming and without knowing what international guarantees would be given to ensure her

/own

own security and the security of the Arab population of Jerusalem.

Subsequently, in a letter to the Chairman of the Commission, the Prime Minister elaborated his position. He said that it was not possible at present to give any final views on the subject and that consideration will be given to the matter after Transjordan is informed of the measures to be taken by the United Nations to implement the resolution and provide guarantees. He emphasized that his Government would not now finally decide on the impossibility of carrying out the resolution but would study the subject and give a decision after being informed of the means and guarantees. He said that all that he had expressed was the preparedness of his Government to study the subject after getting the information referred to.

IRAQ: The Chairman raised the question of Jerusalem and remarked that certain other Arab Governments seemed ready to accept the principle of internationalization if there were adequate guarantees. Mr. Khalidy replied that his Government could not accept the principle of internationalization. His Government saw no justification for any change in the status of the City which had been Arab for centuries. When pressed by Mr. Yalchin and the Chairman, Mr. Khalidy insisted that he was under instruction to say that Iraq could not accept the principle of internationalization.

Subsequently, the Chairman reported to the Commission that the Iraq representative had privately communicated to him, apparently after receiving new

/instructions

instructions, an attitude generally similar to that of several of the other States. The revised Iraq position was that the Iraq Government would not object to internationalization if the proposed regime would provide adequate guarantees of permanence and stability.

SAUDI ARABIA: The Chairman asked whether Saudi Arabia was prepared to accept the idea of internationalization. After an exchange of remarks, the representative of Saudi Arabia said that it would be difficult for his Government to define its attitude before knowing first, the exact nature of the proposed regime, and second, what guarantees would be given concerning the protection of the Arabs, free access to the Holy Places and prohibition of Jewish immigration to the Holy City. Once the internationalization regime was fully and clearly defined, he said his Government would be perfectly willing to express its opinion.

Mr. Yalchin remarked that he regarded the statement as an acceptance of the principle of internationalization. The Minister replied that this was not an accurate interpretation of his statement. He said his Government would have to wait until the statute had been elaborated before they could pronounce upon it. In the meantime, it was impossible for his Government to say whether it would or would not accept the statute as formerly drafted.

/SYRIA:

SYRIA: At the second meeting with the representative of Syria the Chairman asked a direct question about the attitude of the Syrian Government towards the internationalization of Jerusalem. The Syrian representative replied that the resolution gives the Commission certain specific functions to perform and that the Syrian Government considered that it could not ask the Commission to desist from the performance of these functions. He said that discussion of the Jerusalem question was premature until a statute for the international regime had been elaborated. His Government might then have questions, but they had nothing at present to say on the subject.
