

UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

DOCUMENTS
INDEX UNIT

MASTER

21 DEC 1950

RESTRICTED

SR/165

20 June 1950

ENGLISH

Original: FRENCH

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 20 June 1950, at 11 am.

Present:

Mr. de BOISANGER (France)

Chairman

Mr. ERALP (Turkey)

Mr. BARCO* (United States of America)

Mr. de AZCARATE

Principal Secretary

* Alternate

1. Replacement of Mr. YALCIN

The CHAIRMAN announced that the Commission had been officially informed of Mr. Yalcin's departure. He would like to take the opportunity of saying how much he regretted a decision which would deprive the Commission of a most co-operative colleague. For more than a year, Mr. Yalcin had taken an active part in the work of the Commission very much to its advantage.

He asked Mr. Eralp to be kind enough to transmit to Mr. Yalcin his sincere regrets at his departure.

Mr. BARCO (United States of America) shared the Chairman's regrets. He was, however, glad to learn that Mr. Yalcin would be replaced by Mr. Eralp.

The PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, on behalf of the Secretariat, also associated himself with those sentiments.

2. Future activities of the Commission (return to Jerusalem)

The CHAIRMAN recalled that on several occasions the members of the Commission had, in private conversation, discussed the possibility of an early return to Jerusalem. No decision had, however, as yet been taken. Indeed, it was hardly possible to take one before a reply was received from the Government of Jordan to the note sent to it on 30 May 1950.

At the time of his visit to Amman, the King and the Government of Jordan had seemed favourably inclined towards the proposal subsequently put forward in the above note. The reply might therefore be in the affirmative and should be awaited before other measures were taken. In any case, it did not seem advisable at that stage, to give the impression that the Commission intended to go back to Jerusalem and that it had abandoned its proposal owing to the negative replies received from Egypt, Lebanon and Syria.

Moreover, that change of front on the part of the Commission might be incomprehensible to the Government of Israel. When visiting Jerusalem, he had himself told Mr. Sharett that the Commission proposed to set up mixed committees, even where only two States were prepared to participate.

He therefore suggested that the Principal Secretary be instructed to send a telegram to Mr. Quimper and Mr. Fisher asking them to go to Amman and inform the Government of Jordan that the Commission was still hoping for a favourable reply to its proposal.

The Government of Jordan should be clearly made to understand that the Commission's proposal was still open and that it hoped for an early reply. Should that reply be in the affirmative, he thought the time would have come to ask the Arab States to appoint observers to the mixed committees.

On the other hand, it would doubtless be better to make no mention, as yet, of the place where the mixed committees were to meet, in case Jordan should prefer the meetings to be held at Geneva.

Mr. ERALP (Turkey) had understood that the Commission intended in any case to go back to Jerusalem about the 10th of July. Should a favourable reply be received before the Commission's departure, the discussions might be started at Geneva. If not, the Commission would be able to open negotiations with Jordan immediately after its arrival at Jerusalem.

The CHAIRMAN still felt that it would be preferable to wait for Jordan's reply before leaving Geneva. Should Jordan agree to start conversations at Geneva, it would be annoying if the Commission were obliged to come back from Jerusalem.

So far it had not appeared opportune to press Jordan for a reply, but as the Arab League had stated its attitude, the position was no longer the same.

Mr. BARCO (United States of America) agreed with that view. He felt, however, that the Commission might decide to go to Jerusalem should no reply be received from Jordan. The absence of a reply or an unfavourable one would not prevent the Commission from starting negotiations with Jordan immediately on its arrival at Jerusalem.

He thought that a telegram should be sent to Mr. Quimper and Mr. Fisher on the lines suggested by the Chairman, but that it would be premature to mention the possibility of asking the Arab States to send observers. The views of Jordan on the matter should first be ascertained.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that it would be better not to mention that possibility in the first telegram. He had spoken with the Arab delegations before their departure and had found them not unfavourable to the idea. Mostapha Bey, amongst others, had told him that he would sound his Government on the subject.

The Commission unanimously decided to instruct the Principal Secretary to send a telegram to Mr. Quimper and Mr. Fisher on the lines suggested by the Chairman, due account being taken of Mr. Barco's observations.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to await the arrival of Mr. Palmer before considering the preparations to be made for a possible departure for Jerusalem.

It was so decided.

3. 7th Periodic Progress Report

The CHAIRMAN instructed the Secretariat to draw up the 7th periodic progress report. That report would summarize the Commission's activities as from 8 May and would stress the strenuous efforts it had made to achieve results and its failure to do so.

The PRINCIPAL SECRETARY asked whether that report was to be drawn up in the same way as the preceding ones and whether it would not be advisable to include in an annex the text of the notes exchanged with the various delegations. He pointed out, however, that it would, for instance, be difficult to include in an annex the summary record of the last meeting containing Mr. Shukairy's statement. He considered that before doing so it would be necessary to obtain his consent.

Moreover, as the review of the situation made by the Israeli representative on 29 March had not been included in the last report - a matter which had given rise to comment by Mr. Kahany - it might be somewhat difficult to include Mostapha Bey's and Mr. Shukairy's reviews in the report under consideration. For that reason, he thought it would be better to adopt the usual procedure.

Mr. BARCO (United States of America) thought that a distinction should be made between official replies and observations made by delegations during meetings. The Commission might include official replies in an annex to the report, and simply summarise observations made at meetings.

In his opinion, the Israeli representative's statement on 29 March was of a general nature and did not constitute an official reply. It was not, therefore, necessary to attach it to the Commission's report. In any case,

however, it was for the Commission to say what it wished to do.

Mr. ERALP (Turkey) agreed with that view.

The CHAIRMAN was quite aware of the difficulties involved and agreed that it should be left to the Principal Secretary to draw up a draft report in the most appropriate manner.

It was so decided.

4. Communication of certain Summary Records to the Syrian delegation

The PRINCIPAL SECRETARY informed the Commission that the Syrian delegation had asked him to provide them with a copy of the summary record of the meeting on 12 May 1949, and of those of the four subsequent meetings at which the Israeli delegation had been present. In reply, he had stated that the rule was that copies of summary records should only be given to delegations that had been present at the meetings. The Commission would have to give a ruling after consulting the delegations present at the meetings, before summary records could be communicated to other delegations.

He had therefore got into touch with Mr. Kahany who had promised him to take the necessary action.

He did not consider that a decision was required at the moment; the Commission should simply take note of what had been done in that connection.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN informed the Commission that two telegrams had been received from Jerusalem, one on the subject of press comments on frontier incidents, and another from Mr. Fisher concerning a conversation he had had with General Dayan.

In his opinion, that conversation evinced a regrettable attitude on the part of the competent Israeli authorities and, provided the Commission had no objection, he proposed to inform his Government of it in confidence.

Further, he suggested that the Commission send a telegram to Mr. Fisher to the effect that it approved his reply to General Dayan.

Mr. ERAIP (Turkey) shared the Chairman's view.

Mr. BARCO (United States of America) also thought that a telegram should be sent to Mr. Fisher, but felt that too much importance should not be attached to General Dayan's personal opinion, which was not necessarily that of the Israeli Government.

He also considered that the telegram should point out that the Commission could not prevent the press from commenting on frontier incidents.

The Commission decided to send Mr. Fisher a telegram on the lines suggested by the Chairman.

Mr. BARCO (United States of America) informed the Commission that, prior to his departure, the Syrian representative had sent him a memorandum on the Commission's proposal for the establishment of mixed committees. Whilst stressing that he had drawn up that memorandum without consulting the other Arab delegations, the Syrian representative had told him that they would probably be prepared to accept it.

The representative of the United States of America considered that the Commission should examine this memorandum as, in his opinion, it contained some interesting ideas. In some ways, the suggestions made therein went further than the Commission's proposal. Moreover, if it were true that the Arab delegations were disposed to accept it, their attitude had undergone a change for the better.

He then submitted to the Commission a letter from General Kennedy

The CHAIRMAN said that the Commission would examine the Syrian representative's proposal.

He also considered that a reply should be sent to General Kennedy's letter, which was fully in line with the Commission's views. In that reply, the Principal Secretary might state that, while the Commission had not yet taken a decision, it had in mind a possible return to Jerusalem. He might also say that should General Kennedy send a representative to Geneva, the Commission would be glad to get in touch with him.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.