



RESTRICTED

A/AC.25/SR.273  
23 November 1951

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

## UNITED NATIONS CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

## SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at the Hôtel de Crillon, Paris,  
on Friday, 23 November 1951, at 10.45 a.m.

## CONTENTS:

Consideration of the draft conclusions of the Commission's  
report to the Secretary-General

## PRESENT:

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. PALMER	United States of America
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. MARCHAL	France
	Mr. ARAS	Turkey
<u>Alternates:</u>	Mr. BARCO	United States of America
	Mr. de NICOLAY	France
	Mr. TEPEDELEN	Turkey
<u>Secretariat:</u>	Mr. de AZCARATE	Principal Secretary
	Mr. FISHER	Political Officer

CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT CONCLUSIONS OF THE COMMISSION'S  
REPORT TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The CHAIRMAN read the draft conclusions paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 - 4 were adopted as read.

Paragraph 5: The CHAIRMAN having pointed out a contradiction in the wording of this paragraph, Mr. MARCHAL (France) suggested that the phrase "the Commission continues to believe that on both sides of the armistice demarcation lines there is an earnest desire to co-operate ..." should be replaced by the following: "the Commission recognizes that both sides have expressed their desire to co-operate ..."

This was agreed.

At the suggestion of Mr. ARAS (Turkey), it was agreed that in the last sentence, the word "also" should be deleted, and that the word "prepared" should be replaced by the words "now ready".

Paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 6: Mr. ARAS (Turkey) suggested that the sixth paragraph in which it was stated that the Government of Israel was not prepared to implement the part of paragraph 11 of the General Assembly resolution of 11 December 1948 concerning repatriation, should include a reference to the statement of the Government of Israel that it could not agree to such implementation owing to immigration into Israel.

It was pointed out that in the factual section of the report the reasons for the attitudes of the parties were explained in detail, and that the present section merely recapitulated the main points. Mr. Aras therefore expressed his agreement with the paragraph as read.

Paragraph 6 was adopted as read.

Paragraph 7: Mr. ARAS (Turkey) felt that it would be preferable for the Commission not to state that the Arab Governments "have maintained their hostile attitude towards Israel involving an economic blockade and a diplomatic boycott of that country". The Arab Governments had constantly reaffirmed their obligations under their respective Armistice Agreements, and Mr. Aras therefore felt that the reference to "hostile attitude" should be dropped. He also suggested that no mention should be made of "a diplomatic boycott" in the same sentence, as in any event the Arab States were under no obligation to establish diplomatic relations with Israel.

After a discussion, the CHAIRMAN suggested that the second half of the second sentence, quoted by Mr. Aras, should be omitted. He felt that the sentence would gain strength if that were done. The second sentence of this paragraph would then read as follows: "The Arab Governments in their contacts with the Commission have evinced no readiness to arrive at such a peace settlement with the Government of Israel".

This was agreed.

Paragraph 7 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 8: Mr. ARAS (Turkey) proposed that after the words "... general agreement or partial agreements could be sought through direct negotiations between them ...", the Commission might introduce the idea of mediation.

Mr. MARCHAL (France) agreed, and in order to make it clear that such mediation should take place within the framework of direct negotiations, he suggested replacing the words "under United Nations auspices" by the phrase "with United Nations assistance or mediation".

This was agreed.

Mr. ARAS (Turkey) felt it was important not to give the impression that, in suggestion that "... general agreement or partial agreements could be sought through direct negotiations, with United Nations assistance or mediation", the Commission wished to indicate that that was the only way in which peace might be achieved.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN thought the wording of the paragraph made it quite clear that the Commission was merely putting forward a suggestion as to the way in which it felt that a peace settlement was most likely to be achieved, and that there was no idea of restricting the parties to such a procedure.

Paragraph 8 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 9: Mr. ARAS (Turkey) suggested omitting the words "economic and political" in the phrase "... as well as the economic and political changes which have occurred in Palestine during the past three years ...".

This was agreed.

A slight drafting change was made in the French text, consisting of replacing "ce fait" by "cette situation de fait".

Paragraph 9 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 10 was adopted, with a slight drafting change.

Draft final paragraph (prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of the views expressed at the previous meeting by the members of the Commission):

The CHAIRMAN, speaking as United States representative, felt that for the purpose of the present report it was not desirable for the Commission to make any recommendations. The Commission had stated its conclusions, indicating the lines along which it was thinking. It might therefore be preferable for the members of the Commission to consult further with their delegations concerning recommendations which might be put forward by the Commission at the time of the discussion of the report in the Ad Hoc Political Committee.

Mr. MARCEAU (France) felt that the draft final paragraph under consideration was too vague to be of value. There were two points the Commission should stress when making its recommendations.

In the first place, so long as the parties could not reach agreement, it would be necessary for a United Nations political body, with general competence for the whole Palestine problem, to be maintained. In the conclusions of the report, and also in the draft paragraph under discussion, the need for

co-ordination was emphasized. He was in favour of stressing not so much the need for co-ordination as the need for maintaining such a political body with general competence for the entire problem.

Secondly, in view of the fact that the Commission had maintained constant contacts with the governments concerned during the three years of its work in the Middle East, it no longer appeared necessary for the competent political body to remain permanently in the Middle East. Its headquarters seat should preferably be in New York, at the headquarters of the United Nations, and it could merely be represented in the Middle East.

Those were the main ideas which in his opinion should form the basis of the recommendations to be made by the Commission.

After a brief discussion, there was general agreement that the suggestions of the representative of France could be used as a basis for elaborating any recommendations the Commission might make. It was decided, however, not to include any recommendations in the present report, which would thus end at paragraph 10 of the Conclusions, but to submit such recommendations at the time of the discussion in the Ad Hoc Political Committee concerning the Commission's report.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Commission should turn its attention at an early date to drafting the statement to be read by the Chairman before the Ad Hoc Political Committee.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.