

this was in contemplation, called upon the Israeli Government and requested them not to transfer their Foreign Ministry to Jerusalem.

We feel that way because we believe that it would embarrass the United Nations, which has a primary responsibility for determining the future status of Jerusalem. You may recall that the presently standing United Nations resolution about Jerusalem contemplates that it should be to a large extent at least an international city rather than a purely national city. Also, we feel that this particular action by the Government of Israel at this particular time is inopportune in relation to the tensions which exist in the Near East, tensions which are rather extreme, and that this will add to rather than relax any of these tensions.

The views that I express here are, we know, shared by a considerable number of other governments who have concern with the development of an atmosphere of peace and good will in that part of the world.

We have notified the Government of Israel that we do not intend to move our own Embassy to Jerusalem.

No. 646

974.500/7-3053: Airgram

The Secretary of State to the Embassy in Egypt

SECRET

WASHINGTON, July 30, 1953.

A-29. Reference minutes United States-United Kingdom-French discussions on freedom of transit of Suez Canal, Deptel 113, July 27¹ and Cairo's 137, July 28.¹

Possible Egyptian unilateral declaration quoted Deptel 113 tabled by United States at meeting July 29. French and United Kingdom delegates stated would transmit draft to their Governments, and ask for instructions.

In informal discussion of draft, British and French delegates stressed two points:

1. Disadvantages of eliminating numbered paragraphs contained in United Kingdom-French draft (Deptel 108 to Cairo)² which spelled out principles upon which freedom of transit based, and substitution as last paragraph of general statement of those principles. Both delegates felt principles should be fully stated so that all

¹ Not printed.

² Document 643.