

UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

RESTRICTED

SR/126  
10 February 1950

ENGLISH  
Original: FRENCH

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,  
on Friday, 10 February 1950, at 11 a.m.

Present:

Mr. PALMER (United States of America)	Chairman
Mr. de BOISANGER (France)	
Mr. ERALP* (Turkey)	
Mr. de AZCARATE	Principal Secretary

\* Alternate

---

The CHAIRMAN gave an account of the interview which Mr. Barco and he himself had had with Mr. Mikaoui the previous evening. He had formed the impression that, for the time being at any rate, the Arab delegations were not in favour of the Commission's holding meetings with each delegation separately, at least as far as official meetings were concerned. On the other hand, they were anxious for an opportunity to reply to the statement read from the chair at the first meeting and to the memorandum submitted by the Israeli representative. It had to be admitted that their request seemed natural enough in view of the fact that they had been invited as a body by the Commission to hear the statement from the chair.

During the interview Mr. MIKAOUI had affirmed that not all the Arab delegations were contemplating direct negotiations, seeing that the Israeli delegation showed no signs of being in a conciliatory frame of mind. Mr. Sayre (Head of the United States delegation to the Trusteeship Council) had also provided some information which suggested that the attitude of Mr. Roch towards the matter was similar to that of Mr. Mikaoui.

Mr. Mikaoui had stated quite definitely that to his knowledge no negotiations were taking place between Jordan and the State of Israel. That statement seemed to suggest that the Arab delegations as a whole were maintaining a united front vis-à-vis the Commission. It appeared, therefore, that the Commission should fall in with their wishes and invite them to a joint meeting.

Mr. de BOISANGER (France) said that Mr. Mikaoui had expressed similar views to him, whereas Mr. Mostafa had stated that he saw no purpose in a plenary meeting of the Commission with all the Arab delegations. The members of the Jordan delegation likewise saw no point in holding a plenary meeting until the bases for discussion had been fixed. In view of those divergent opinions, he considered it preferable for the Secretariat to intimate to the Arab delegations that the Commission was prepared, if they so desired, to hold a plenary meeting with them. It would not, however, be advisable to be too insistent on a meeting of that kind.

He had informed Mr. Eban, whom he had met the day before, that the Arab delegations were not prepared to undertake direct conversations, that the Commission for its part desired to help things forward by setting up ad hoc mixed Committees and, finally, that the work of such Committees would clearly have to be based on the relevant General Assembly Resolutions.

As the above statements aroused no opposition on Mr. Eban's part, he then showed the Israeli representative the draft communiqué which he had already submitted to the Commission at a previous meeting. The Israeli representative had requested the deletion of the word "technical" from the term "Technical Committees" in the first part of the draft, and had stated that with regard to

the second part he would give his reply later. He had seemed to appreciate that there was no other possible basis of work than the Resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

He, the French representative, added that, when he mentioned to Mr. Mostafa the possibility of a private interview with the Commission, the latter had indicated that he would be willing to accept such an invitation. He proposed therefore that the Commission fix that interview for Monday, 13 February, provided that Mr. Eban had by that time transmitted his reply with regard to the passages in the draft communiqué which were still outstanding.

The representatives of Jordan, with whom he had also had conversations, appeared to be favourably disposed to the idea of setting up mixed technical committees for the implementation of the General Assembly Resolutions. He had requested them to discuss that proposal with the other Arab delegations. The Jordan representatives would have preferred joint meetings, but he had requested them to leave it to the Commission to decide, in each case, the form a particular committee should take.

He had also expressed to Mr. Eban the hope that the Israeli Government would approach the question of compensation for losses sustained by the Arabs in a very liberal spirit. The Israeli representative had replied that he would think over the matter and refer it to his Government.

He had further informed the Israeli representative that, if the Commission was to succeed in its task, it must act with a certain amount of authority and that the attitude of Israel had always tended to weaken the Commission's authority.

Mr. ERALP (Turkey) was afraid that a general meeting might afford the Arab delegations an opportunity of reiterating their grievances. He was in favour of a meeting between the Commission and Mr. Mostafa and asked whether the Commission would show Mr. Mostafa the draft communiqué, as Mr. de Boisanger had done in the case of Mr. Eban.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, if a plenary meeting was held, the risk of an exchange of retorts and rejoinders between the parties might be avoided by warning the Arab delegations at the outset against the disadvantages of submitting their arguments in the form of accusations. The Committee could nonetheless leave them free to expound their views and endeavour to bring out the points of interest in their statements.

He added that he was still in favour of the proposed private meeting with Mr. Mostafa.

The PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, in support of the information given by the Chairman and Mr. de Boisanger on the attitude of the various Arab delegations, stated that Mr. Mikaoui had said to him quite spontaneously "we should like to have a meeting with the Commission", thus giving the impression that he was in fact speaking on behalf of the various Arab delegations. Mr. Mostafa on the other hand, had showed some surprise at the proposal when informed of it by the speaker and had added that it was for the Commission to take the initiative in the matter if it thought fit.

In reply to a question by the Chairman, he stated that the Arab delegations had at present no appointed spokesman for their dealings with the Secretariat of the Commission.

After discussion, the Commission came to the conclusion that there was no objection to receiving Mr. Mostafa without sending similar invitations the same day to the other Arab delegations. There were a number of signs suggesting that the Arab delegations recognized that Mr. Mostafa enjoyed a certain right of precedence.

The Commission requested the Principal Secretary to inform Mr. Mostafa that the members of the Commission would be pleased to meet him on Monday, 13 February at 11 a.m.

#### Programme of the ordinary meetings of the Commission

On the proposal of the CHAIRMAN, the Commission decided to hold three ordinary meetings per week, on Monday afternoon and on Wednesday and Friday mornings.

The CHAIRMAN asked the other members of the Commission on what date they considered his chairmanship should terminate and proposed that in future the country whose member was in the chair should be represented on the Commission by an alternate.

The Commission decided that Mr. Palmer should remain Chairman at least until the Commission's forthcoming visit to Paris and that the question of his relinquishment of the Chairmanship and of alternative representation should be examined at a later date.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.