

UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

RESTRICTED

SR/250

12 October 1951

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL : FRENCH

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH MEETING

Held at the Hôtel de Crillon, Paris,
on Friday, 12 October 1951, at 11.30 a.m.

CONTENTS

- Communication from the United States Department of State
- Elaboration of Point One of the Commission's comprehensive pattern of proposals (W/73)

PRESENT

Chairman : Mr. PALMER United States of America

Members : Mr. MARCHAL France

Mr. ARAS Turkey

Alternates : Mr. BARCO United States of America

Mr. de NICOLAY France

Mr. TEPEDELEN Turkey

Secretariat : Mr. de AZCARATE Principal Secretary

Mr. CONTINI Legal Adviser

.. /

COMMUNICATION FROM THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The CHAIRMAN informed the Commission that he had received a telegram from the State Department paying tribute to the Commission's patience and perseverance. The State Department thought the Commission was doing good work but should not make useless efforts; for that reason the State Department was disposed, in the event of a complete impasse, to ask the United States representatives to the five parties, to indicate, if necessary, to the Governments concerned that the United States Government regretted that the parties had not yet taken advantage of the present possibility of making progress towards a solution. The United States thought the conference provided an opportunity for clarifying the problem and presenting a well documented report to the General Assembly. The State Department considered that the parties had an excellent opportunity for reaching agreement, at least in a certain measure, on some of the outstanding problems, and it could give them the assurance that the Conciliation Commission would do its utmost to facilitate such agreement.

The State Department also expressed the hope that the Governments of France and Turkey would make a similar démarche to the Governments concerned, indicating, however, that it would be better not to enter into the substance of the question.

Mr. ARAS (Turkey) shared the State Department's view concerning the uselessness of the Commission's efforts and added that its work would also have the advantage of clarifying the question in the minds of all concerned and paving the way for the future. His Government would willingly associate itself with the suggested démarche.

Mr. MARCHAL (France) thought the time had not yet come to take such a step, but believed that the French Government would be quite willing to make a démarche of the nature contemplated by the State Department. However, he would like in due course to see the exact text of what the State Department intended to say.

/ Mr. BARCO

Mr. BARCO (United States) announced that he had just had a conversation with Mostafa Bey, who had given him to understand that the Arab delegations were impatient to continue the discussions. Mostafa Bey had taken the opportunity of reaffirming their intention to cooperate sincerely with the Commission.

Mr. Barco had reminded him that the intention was not to begin to examine the substance of the proposals before the two parties had made known their reply to the Commission's letter, but had added that the examination would probably begin very soon.

The CHAIRMAN supposed that the Arabs considered they had already adequately explained their attitude. He thought, however, that they should at least acknowledge the Commission's letter. Their show of impatience was probably a way of publicising their acceptance of the principle of agreement to the examination of the proposals. Israel, for its part, was awaiting its Government's instructions before replying to the letter.

ELABORATION OF POINT ONE OF THE COMMISSION'S COMPREHENSIVE PATTERN OF PROPOSALS (W/73)

The CHAIRMAN thought this working document very useful. The first part was of great interest to the Commission and the second part might well serve as a basis for a statement by the Commission to the parties, explaining its attitude on the question without placing too much emphasis on its legal aspects.

He thought that for the sake of exactitude the word "resolutions" should be added after the words "United Nations" in the last line of the document, in order to avoid any possibility of misinterpretation.

Mr. CONTINI (Legal Adviser) explained that he had not wanted to be as precise as that in the text, in order to avoid inferring that the parties could not negotiate directly or that the United Nations might object to a settlement not in conformity with its directives.

Mr. ARAS (Turkey) thought Mr. Contini's explanation only served to support the Chairman's suggestion. In fact the United Nations could not prevent

direct negotiations; it could only request that the principles it had formulated should be taken into account.

Mr. MARCHAL (France) also thought that the information contained in the first part of the working document was useful to the Commission and that the second part could be used in a declaration. Such a declaration should, however, allude as little as possible to the legal aspects of the problem, as they were numerous and might provoke interminable discussions. In fact a State could only present claims for reparations in respect of damage caused on its territory; but the Arab Governments did not recognise Israel as possessing any territory, which made the legal problem extremely complicated.

The CHAIRMAN thought the best plan was to leave it to the Secretariat to write a draft declaration based on the second part of the working document and taking into account the observations just made.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.
