

mentation of the programme; it is the basis for questioning the function of the Coordinating Committee of representatives of national tracing bureaux at the Central Tracing Bureau. Most important, it underlies two basic problems concerning the ultimate disposition of the tracing bureau and the selection of a terminal legatee to carry on the functions of the U.N.R.R.A. bureaux at its dissolution.

B. THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LIAISON AND COORDINATION.

The first of these problems is the extent to which U.N.R.R.A. is responsible for the maintenance of Liaison and for the coordination of tracing activities on an international level.

The position of the Allied Control Authority in regard to the responsibility for liaison and coordination within the service is stated in the Central Tracing Policy Board's confirmation of U.N.R.R.A.'s acceptance. It is clear that the responsibility for maintaining liaison between the Central Tracing Service, of which by agreement the U.N.R.R.A. Central Tracing Bureau had become a part, and any other organization in or outside of Germany is the province of the Central Tracing Policy Board. The agreement further specified that this responsibility should be discharged in close cooperation with the Director of the Central Tracing Bureau³.

Paragraph five of the London Policy statement, on the other hand, assigned that responsibility in so far as it concerns persons eligible for U.N.R.R.A. care to the European Regional Office of U.N.R.R.A.

Footnotes:

1. The question was first raised by the Director General of UNRRA by Cable (103 Frankfurt, Repeated London 10409) to the Director of the Central Tracing Bureau, in late January 1946.
2. The extension of the principle of forwarding to other agencies enquiries for those not eligible for UNRRA care to include both the enquirer and the enquiree has also been suggested. (Draft on Statement of Policy, Tracing of Missing Persons, UNRRA, European Regional Office, A, (3)). This extension would completely undermine any tracing activity, for only rarely are both parties eligible for UNRRA care.

G. ICBRA's Long Term Responsibilities

Within the limitation expressed, it cannot be denied.

Nevertheless, the extent to which this responsibility touches upon the larger issue of the co-ordination of activities of the national bodies, their relation with each other, and the rights of calling international conferences dealing with tracing problems can be questioned as falling outside the limitations of the policy statement. At the best, it raises issues which must be clarified on the highest levels between the parties to the agreement.

and experience (A, 2, 3). Specifically this obligation is defined to be "to establish, stabilize and maintain the process of tracing missing persons and of collecting and distributing records concerning them within the limits of its agreement with the Allied Control Authority, and to insure the transfer of that process to a terminal legatee upon its dissolution" (Para A, 6.)

Footnote: Stabilization of the Tracing Process

3. A similar position between the Director of the Central Tracing Bureau and E.R.O. in regard to tracing problems in Germany is implied in the interpretation of Paragraph five of the London Statement. (See above VI, note 2).

There is some question, however, as to the extent to which the stabilization of that process should be interpreted to include a widespread reorganization of the service on the eve of its transfer to a terminal legatee. That procedure should be adjusted constantly to new situations and simplified as much as possible is beyond question, but any considerable reorganization of the system which would entail extensive re-negotiations should be viewed with suspect until basic decisions as to the final disposition of the activity have been made. This is particularly true as it affects the position of the Central Tracing Bureau. A fundamental re-distribution of functions between it and the National and Local Bureaux would only disrupt the service unnecessarily

Within the limitations expressed, it cannot be denied.
 Nevertheless, the extent to which this responsibility should
 upon the larger sense of the organization of activities of the
 national bodies, their relations with each other, and the rights
 of setting international conferences dealing with trading goods
 have not been questioned as far as the interests of the
 policy statements. At the same time, it is clear that such
 should be on the highest level between the nations to the
 agreement.

Footnote

3. A similar position between the members of the Central
 Trading Board and S.W.O. in regard to trading policies in
 Germany is noted in the investigation of paragraph five
 of the London Statement. (See also VI, para 5).