



principle, it was now apparent that it wished to discuss matters of detail, such as the number of refugees Israel was willing to accept within its territory. Such an attitude left the Arab Governments with the impression that the United Nations was more concerned to carry out Jewish requirements than to give effect to the principles of the General Assembly's resolution; furthermore, the Jews were thereby encouraged to increase their claims and to intensify their tendency to confront the world with faits accomplis. In the view of the Arab States, the most important principle of the Assembly's resolution was the recommendation that the refugees should return to their homes. The United Nations, in instructing the Conciliation Commission to carry out this provision, had not specified that its execution was to be dependent on its acceptability or unacceptability to the Jews. The Prime Minister stressed that in this matter Transjordan could act only in conjunction with the other Arab States, all of whom were unanimous in urging that the resolution of the General Assembly relating to refugees should be fully implemented.

The Prime Minister added that there was no contradiction between this standpoint and the preparatory measures that the Transjordan Government proposed to take should the need arise. He instanced the fact that it would be very difficult to reinstall some of the refugees whose homes were in the Jewish occupied parts of Arab Palestine, and that plans were being considered to settle them in other parts of Palestine. In conclusion, the Prime Minister asked what exactly was meant by the return of refugees to their homes, particularly in the case of those whose property and homes were in districts which were given to the Jews or occupied by Jewish forces.

The CHAIRMAN wished to point out that the Commission did not adopt any fixed position concerning the problems under discussion; its concern was to study the points of view of the interested parties. He assured the Prime Minister that the Commission was fully aware

that the principle of the refugees' return to their homes was basic to the Assembly's resolution, and that it would continue to urge the Government of Israel to accept that principle. The Commission, however, was confronted with the situation de fait.

As regards the Prime Minister's question, the Chairman found it difficult to answer it without knowing the exact boundaries that would be established. He emphasised that the Commission was not bound by the Plan of Partition adopted by the Assembly in 1947; no mention of that Plan was made in the Resolution of December 11, 1948, and moreover the Partition frontiers were no longer accepted by the Israeli Government. He stressed that the Commission was anxious to learn what it could do for the immediate relief of the refugees, and further what it could do for those refugees who did not wish to go to Israel.

The PRIME MINISTER declared that in the first place Transjordan was in complete agreement with the other Arab Governments in demanding the return of the refugees to districts in which their properties and lands were situated, in accordance with the Assembly's resolution. He added that in his view it was unreasonable that certain resolutions of the Assembly should be fully carried out while others were put aside and efforts were made to devise alternative measures on the grounds that these resolutions were inapplicable. Secondly, the Prime Minister emphasised that any supplementary discussions on the subject would merely delay a solution to the problem. He added that the Arab Governments hoped that the Commission would report to the General Assembly at its April session, in order that the Assembly could take a final decision on frontiers and either confirm or modify its resolution of December 11, 1948. As regards the practical details asked for by the Commission, the Transjordan Government, while ready to do its best to improve the situation of the refugees, felt that their general welfare was a matter for the various relief organisations.

principle of internationalisation and that she was ready to withdraw her forces from the Jerusalem area, a step that she by no means contemplated at the present juncture.

As regards the general question of Jerusalem, the Prime Minister stressed that there was no unanimous desire on the part of the Arab States to internationalise the city. His understanding was that while Syria and Iraq strongly opposed internationalisation, Lebanon favoured it, whereas Egypt was considering the possibility of an international Old City under an Arab Mandatory and a New City administered by Israel under United Nations control.

The CHAIRMAN indicated that the points of view of these governments, as expressed to the Commission, differed somewhat from the standpoints described by the Prime Minister.

Mr. YALCHIN asked whether the declaration made by the Prime Minister could be interpreted by the Commission as an acceptance of the principle of internationalization.

The PRIME MINISTER stated that Transjordan was not opposed to the principle of internationalization, provided that she could be quite sure that certain guarantees would be given. In the first place, Transjordan could not accept internationalization unless she could be certain that the means of carrying out such a measure were forthcoming; and secondly, she would wish to know what international guarantees would be given to ensure her own security and the security of the Arab population of Jerusalem.

The CHAIRMAN thanked the representatives of Transjordan for their attendance at the meeting.