

In September 1945, Col. Bowring (for CTB) and Miss Rading (for ERO) attended the Tracing Conference at Brussels in which UNRRA consulted with the Government representatives at their request, but did not participate in any of the final recommendations.

Finally, Mr. Karl Martini, Displaced Persons Headquarters, after his temporary appointment as Consultant on Tracing attached to EPHQ Paris, was instructed to act as UNRRA observer at the International Tracing Congress at Prague on 3rd to 10th March 1947. He was, however, given much wider terms of reference than on the occasion of previous conferences. He was to present to the Tracing Congress UNRRA's functions and limitations in relating to tracing, and he was to consult with the Tracing Congress on subjects within UNRRA's competence.

7. THE HANDING OVER OF TRACING ACTIVITIES BY UNRRA TO A SUCCESSOR ORGANIZATION.

At the Relief Services Conference on May 21-24 1946, a special session was held on Tracing Policies and procedures and a draft directive for the field was prepared and agreed by those present. This directive was drawn up with the consideration in mind that UNRRA was a temporary organisation and that provision should be made for eventual hand-over to a permanent body. This aspect of the problem of UNRRA's tracing activities had already been noted by Mr. Rabinoff, Deputy Director of DP Division ERO in the report which he submitted after returning from Germany in February 1946. On one of the accompanying documents he dealt with the permanent legatee should be nominated as soon as possible to permit orientation and arrangements for transfer starting about July 1st. The draft directive envisaged a greater degree of decentralisation of tracing activities upon the respective Zonal Bureaux which would be empowered to correspond direct with National Tracing Bureaux. The CTB would deal only with the documents and records and with enquiries regarding persons whose Zonal location was unknown. Thus the importance of the CTB in comparison with the Zonal Bureau would be diminished. This draft directive was passed on to Gen. Morgan on June 18th and comments upon it were requested. Gen. Morgan replied by indicating that in his opinion some of the proposals were either undesirable

FF

In September 1947, Col. Bowring (for CIE) and Miss Keating (for IIO) attended the Trading Conference at Brussels in which IIO was consulted with the Government representatives at their request, but did not participate in any of the final recommendations.

Mr. Bowring, Mr. Keating, Miss Keating, Miss Keating, after the temporary appointment as Consultant on Trading attached to IIO Paris, was instructed to act as IIO's observer at the International Trading Conference at Prague on 10th March 1947. He was, however, given much other forms of reference than on the occasion of previous conferences. He was to present to the Trading Conference IIO's functions and limitations in relation to trading, and he was to consult with the Trading Conference on subjects within IIO's competence.

7. THE HANDING OVER OF TRADING ACTIVITIES BY IIO TO A SUCCESSOR ORGANIZATION.

At the initial Services Conference on 17-18-1946, a special session was held on Trading Policies and Procedures and a draft report for the field was prepared and agreed by those present. This document was drawn up with the understanding that IIO was a temporary organization and that provision should be made for eventual hand-over to a permanent body. This aspect of the transfer of IIO's trading activities has already been noted by Mr. Radinoff, Deputy Director of the Division in the report which he submitted after returning from Geneva in February 1946. On one of the accompanying documents he dealt with the permanent transfer should be maintained as soon as possible to permit organization and arrangements for transfer starting about July 1947. The draft directive envisaged a greater degree of decentralization of trading activities than the respective local bureaux which would be expected to correspond closely with the National Trading Bureau. The CIE would deal only with the documents and records and with enquiries regarding transfer of local functions. Thus the importance of the CIE in connection with the local bureaux would be diminished. This draft directive was put up on 10th March 1947 and comments upon it were requested. Comments were received by Mr. Radinoff that in his opinion some of the proposals were either undesirable

or impractical and furthermore that to propose them at the present stage was inappropriate because the CTB was at that time studying the steps necessary to relieve UNRRA of its tracing responsibilities in view of the prospect of the dissolution of UNRRA at the end of 1946.

The next step was taken on September 13th 1946 when General Sir Humphrey Gale, addressed an official communication to the US, UK, French and Soviet members of the Committee of the Council for Europe (CCE), indicating that UNRRA had come to the conclusion that it was no longer appropriate for the Administration to operate the CTB on behalf of the CCG. He explained that it had become increasingly clear that the operation of the CTB was not an essential or integral part of the Displaced Persons Operation, but that it was closely connected with many activities outside the scope of UNRRA's authority. The Chief of Operations in Germany, he said, had already informed the CCG of this view which was set forth in greater detail in an attached memorandum. The Committee of the Council for Europe (CCE) representatives were asked to bring this matter to the attention of their Governments so that appropriate step might be taken. The operating factor in this approach was, of course, the limitation both on UNRRA's mandate and on the funds remaining available for future operations.

On October 4th, 1946, the French representative replied to Sir Humphrey Gale's letter saying that the International Tracing Conference at Brussels on 16th-18th September had recommended the creation of an international tracing service under the United Nations. In Germany and Austria the operation of this service would constitute a special Branch working under the control of the CCG. The French Delegation at the Assembly of the United Nations had been charged with presenting a project of this nature to the Economic and Social Council and hoped for rapid results. The British Government, on the other hand, referred to the fact that CCG had requested UNRRA to continue operating the CTB and Sir Humphrey Gale was asked whether this meant a reconsideration of the UNRRA decision to withdraw from tracing operations. In his reply, Sir Humphrey Gale recited the progress of events which had taken place since the assumption of responsibility by UNRRA from the CCG at the end of 1945. He repeated that CCG had advised CCE that UNRRA wished to terminate its operation of CTB and return it to CCG.

of international and transnational trade to require that at the present stage
 was appropriate because the GOC was at that time studying the steps
 necessary to relate UNRWA to the trading responsibilities in view of the
 prospect of the dissolution of UNRWA at the end of 1966.

The next step was taken on September 19th 1966 when General Sir
 Humphrey Gale, addressed an official communication to the UN, Mr. French
 and other members of the Committee of the Council for Europe (CCE), in-
 dicating that UNRWA had come to the conclusion that it was no longer appro-
 priate for the Administration to operate the CCE on behalf of the GOC.

He explained that it had become increasingly clear that the question of the
 CCE was not an essential or integral part of the European Economic Community,
 but that it was closely connected with other activities outside the scope
 of UNRWA's authority. The Chief of Operations in Beirut, in this regard,
 already informed the GOC of this view which was based on a number of factors
 in an attached memorandum. The Committee of the Council for Europe (CCE)
 representatives were asked to bring this matter to the attention of their
 Governments so that appropriate steps might be taken. It was noted that
 in this approach was, of course, the limitation such as UNRWA's mandate
 and on the funds remaining available for future operations.

On October 14th, 1966, the French representative replied to Sir
 Humphrey Gale's letter saying that the International Trade Centre
 at Geneva on 16th-18th September had recommended the creation of an
 international trading centre under the United Nations. In January and
 Austria the operation of this centre would constitute a special branch
 working under the control of the GOC. The French representative at the time
 of the United Nations had been aware of such a proposal and had
 referred to the Economic and Social Council and noted the need for
 British Government, on the other hand, referred to the fact that the UN had re-
 quested UNRWA to continue operating the CCE and Sir Humphrey Gale was asked
 whether this meant a reconstituted UNRWA or a new institution in which UNRWA
 trading operations. In his reply, Sir Humphrey Gale indicated the
 of events which had taken place since the cessation of responsibility by
 UNRWA from the GOC at the end of 1966. It was noted that the CCE had advised
 GOC that UNRWA wished to terminate the operation of CCE and return it to GOC.

However, the Central Tracing Policy Board informed the CCG that it was recommending to the PWDP Directorate of the CCG that the latter should not take over the CTB and that UNRRA should continue to operate it. In view of this situation in Germany, Sir Humphrey Gale addressed his communication of 13th September to the representatives of the four Governments of CCG. ~~It remained~~ that since that time UNRRA had continued to operate CTB and was only awaiting the replies of the four Governments.

A new difficulty was caused on 29th January 1947 by the decision to close the Central Headquarters UNRRA at Arolsen, and instructions were sent from UNRRA's European Regional Office, London to CIG that the PWDP Directorate of CCG should be informed that the CTB must be out of Arolsen before 15th March and therefore every effort must be made to find a new location. It was, however, considered that at the present stage UNRRA could not say that in the absence of a new location the CTB function would be abandoned by UNRRA. The Allied Control Office for Germany (ACOG) had already sent to the personal representative of the Director General two alternative proposals on organisation in view of the closing down of CIG Arolsen. According to alternative the tracing and child services activities were to be handled in the Zones whose Tracing Bureaux would correspond directly with the National Tracing Bureaux and a Central Records Office would be maintained with a staff of forty, and for this purpose space should be sought in Berlin. Under the second alternative, UNRRA was to confirm its tracing functions to maintaining a "general locator index for DPs under its care"- this could be discharged by maintaining centrally or in Paris a small staff for keeping the index up-to-date on the basis of Assembly Centre records and Displaced Persons movement records. The ACOG recommended the adoption of the first alternative in view of the time element involved and suggested that CCG should be notified accordingly. If, however, the four Governments were willing to release UNRRA immediately from its present obligations, it would be desirable to adopt the second alternative at once.

On January 28th 1947 Mr. Martini, Tracing Consultant CIG conferred with the PWDP Directorate in Berlin. The Directorate felt that none of the activities assigned to the CTB by CCG should be closed down, though

However, the Central Finance Board informed the GOC that it was
recommending to the IFCP Director of the GOC that the factor should not
take over the GIB and that IFCP should continue to operate in
of this situation in Germany, the IFCP has addressed his recommendation
of 13th September to the representatives of the four Governments of GOC.
It reminds that since the IFCP had continued to operate GIB and
was only exercising the rights of the four Governments.

A new difficulty was raised on 13th January 1947 by the decision
to close the Central Headquarters IFCP at Berlin, and instructions were
sent from IFCP's European Regional Office, London to GIB that the IFCP
Directorate of GOC should be informed that the GIB must be out of
before 15th March and therefore every effort must be made to find a new
location. It was, however, considered that at the present stage IFCP could

not say that in the absence of a new location the GIB would be
abandoned by IFCP. The Allied Control Office for Germany (ACOG) has al-
ready sent to the personal representative of the Director General the in-
formative proposals on organization in view of the closing down of GIB
Berlin, according to alternative the training and other services will
visits were to be handled in the home where IFCP's business would be
conducted directly with the National Trading Council and a Central Board

ofices would be maintained with a staff of forty, and the IFCP
space should be sought in Berlin. Under the second alternative, IFCP
to continue its trading functions to maintaining a general business level
the under its care" - this could be discharged by maintaining centrally
to Paris a small staff for issuing the bank up-to-date on the basis of
monthly Centre records and IFCP's records covering Germany. The GOC

representative's objection of the three alternatives in view of the time element
involved and suggested that GOC should be notified accordingly. It was
not, the four Governments were willing to release IFCP immediately from
its present obligations, it would be desirable to agree the second alter-
native at once.

On 1 January 1947 IFCP's Director, Berlin, informed the Director
with the IFCP Directorate in Berlin. The Director's view that some of
the activities assigned to the GIB by GOC should be placed under IFCP

any activities of CTB not assigned by CGC should be dropped. The Directorate placed its requirements in the following order of priority:

- (a) Completion of the work of the Records Branch, including child tracing
- (b) Mass radio and newspaper tracing in order that information obtained therefrom might be passed on to the National Tracing Bureaux.

The Directorate felt that forty UNRRA key personnel, supplemented by local labour, could do the work assigned to CTB. As only five months were left for work under UNRRA, the Directorate was against removing the Records Branch to a new locality as it would involve the loss of two months' work and probably prevent the completion of the task required of it. Furthermore, it was considered impossible at that juncture to find a location for the CTB in Berlin. In the circumstances, the US and British members undertook to see that the Bureau was provided with accommodation supplies, and assistance from Displaced Persons.

This decision of the Directorate placed UNRRA in a quandary because it would mean maintaining at Arolsen an establishment for which provision had not been made and also the Liaison Officers attached to CTB would require to remain. Mr. Martini had emphasised at the meeting of the Directorate that it would be necessary to maintain services for transport, mail, billeting, etc. etc. in Arolsen, but this was not accepted by the Directorate. The Arolsen closure staff could not be given the responsibility for ~~administering~~ administering the CTB which would have to be placed under the US Zone for administrative purposes and this would require discussion and understanding with the US Army. In reply CGC stated that UNRRA was prepared to continue the work of the Records Branch, including child tracing, but was unable to continue mass radio and newspaper tracing. However, regarding the proposal to continue the CTB at Arolsen, UNRRA must insist on the US military taking full responsibility for billets, feeding, medical care, communications, personal mail, transport and transport maintenance, petrol, PX, etc. and administrative personnel. The alternative would be to agree to the UNRRA request for accommodation in Berlin or elsewhere in the US Zone. If neither of these conditions could be met, UNRRA had no alternative but to close CTB completely by March 15th 1947 and to put the records in storage. On February 12th, CGC informed Zone Directors that CTB could

any activities of CIA not assigned to GUS should be stopped. The Director
was placed in the following order of priority:

- (a) Completion of the work of the working party
including child tracing
- (b) Plans for the future and progress towards the
information obtained previously should be passed
on to the National Training Institute.

The Director also felt that work under WEMA was essential, especially
by local labour, could be the work assigned to GUS, as only two months
were left for work under WEMA, the Director was against removing the
labour force to a new facility as it would involve the loss of two months
work and probably prevent the completion of the task required of it.

Further, it was considered impossible to start before the end of the
month for the GUS in Berlin. In the circumstances, the US and British
members undertook to see that the Bureau was provided with accommodation,
supplies, and assistance from displaced persons.

This decision of the Director placed WEMA in a difficult position
as would mean maintaining at least an establishment for which provision
had not been made and also the liaison officers attached to GUS would be
difficult to remain. Mr. Harter had expressed at the meeting of the Dis-
placed Persons Commission to maintain liaison with WEMA, and
WEMA, etc. etc. in Berlin, and this was not accepted by the Dis-
placed Persons Commission. The American element could not be given the responsibility for
maintaining the GUS which would have to be placed under the
US zone for administrative purposes and this would require discussion and
understanding with the US zone. It was agreed that GUS was pro-
posed to continue the work of the working party, including child tracing,
but was unable to continue the work of the working party. However, the
British proposal to continue the GUS at present, but to have an
the US military taking full responsibility for liaison, training, medical,
etc., communications, personnel, etc., equipment and transport arrangements,
etc., etc. and administrative personnel. The administrative staff to be
provided by the WEMA request for accommodation in Berlin or elsewhere in the
US zone. If neither of these conditions could be met, then the GUS should
be closed but to close GUS completely by March 1951 and to put the records
in storage. On February 1951, the Director had discussed with GUS staff

no longer undertake tracing through wireless stations and newspapers and asked whether the Zone Tracing Bureaux could take on this task.

On February 17th 1947, the Directorate replied that it did not consider that UNRRA had the right to close CTB on the authority of the Director-General and thus repudiate its commitments to CCG. Furthermore, it did not consider that UNRRA had the right to offer, as the only alternative to closure, a solution necessitating additional expenditure by one of the occupying powers (US). It considered that UNRRA should continue to administer and finance the CTB until a new organisation succeeded it. If UNRRA repudiated its commitments unilaterally this would be reported to the Coordinating Committee (CCG) with the recommendation that the Control Council should take up the question with the United Nations Organisation.

However, the subject of tracing also came up in the Preparatory Commission of IRO at its meeting in February and March 1947 in Geneva, when a Resolution was passed noting with satisfaction the intention of UNRRA to continue the operation of the CTB until June 30th ~~(see page 28)~~. On the 17th and 18th February, conferences took place between UNRRA and representatives of France, the UK and US, concerning the operation and location of the Central Tracing Bureau, and at these meeting the three Governments representatives gave assurance that they were prepared to assist UNRRA in finding alternative accommodation in Berlin and in instructing their representatives in Berlin to this effect. UNRRA agreed to continue operations in Arolsen until the provision of alternative accommodation. The Administration indicated that the size of the CTB in Berlin would be forty key personnel and a small administrative staff of ten persons responsible for internal servicing. General Sir Humphrey Gale followed up this meeting with letters to the three Powers urging prompt action. A cable was then sent to the Directorate urging reconsideration of the problem, so that within the reduced financial resources available the work might continue until June 30th. The Directorate was informed of Sir Humphrey Gale's approach to the Government representatives who were respectively from the Control Office in London, USFET and the French Control Commission in Berlin.

It may here be added that in his report to the ACOG on the International Tracing Conference at Prague on March 3rd to 5th 1947, which he attended

no longer undertake trading through various countries and as-
 and whether the Zone Trading Bureau could take on this task.

On February 17th 1947, the Directorate reported that it did not con-
 sider that UBERA had the right to claim CTR on the authority of the Direc-
 tor-General and thus requested the Government to UBERA. Furthermore, it did
 not consider that UBERA had the right to claim, as the only alternative to
 UBERA, a solution necessitating additional expenditure by one of the
 occupying powers (U.S.). It considered that UBERA should continue to admin-
 ister and finance the CTR until a new organization succeeded it. It UBERA
 requested the Government to UBERA until the time was reported to the Gov-
 erning Committee (CGC) with the recommendation that the Central Com-
 mittee should take up the question with the United Nations Organization.

However, the subject of UBERA also came up in the Temporary Commission
 of 1940 at its meeting in February and March 1947 in London, when a decision
 was taken to proceed with UBERA until the intention of UBERA to continue
 the operation of the CTR until June 30th 1948. In the 1947 and 1948
 January, conferences took place between UBERA and representatives of the
 U.S. and U.K., concerning the operation and location of the Central Trading
 Bureau, and at these meetings the above Government representatives gave as-
 surances that they were prepared to assist UBERA in London. UBERA was
 contacted in Berlin and in London and its representatives in Berlin
 to this effect. UBERA agreed to continue operations in London until the
 provision of alternative accommodation. The Government indicated that
 the size of the CTR facilities would be fairly big and would be a small addi-
 tive to the staff of ten persons responsible for the Central Trading
 Bureau. Mr. Hanbury Gale followed up this matter with letters to the UBERA
 and UBERA's reply. A cable was then sent to the Directorate on 27th
 consideration of the problem, as this within the context of UBERA's
 facilities the work might continue until June 1948. The Directorate was
 informed of Mr. Hanbury Gale's opinion on the Directorate representatives
 were respectively from the Central Office in London, UBERA and the UBERA
 Central Commission in Berlin.

It may have been at this time that the report to the CGC on the Inter-
 national Trading Conference at Prague on March 2nd to 5th 1947, which is en-
 closed.

on behalf of UNRRA, Mr. Martini records that:

"The members of the Conference were taking as an accomplished fact the preliminary and tentative assurances which had been given at Geneva on and following 12th February to the effect that IRO would sponsor completely a tracing service which would meet the needs of all national governments."

He went on to make the following important points:

"The UNRRA representative pointed out informally the difficulties and limitations dependent from IRO sponsorship for the usual reasons, and primarily for the reason that any Refugee Organization working with limited funds would present to National Tracing Bureaux many of the limitations which from their standpoint UNRRA's tracing activities now brought about.

It was pointed out that the IRO or any Refugee Organization would presumably concern itself primarily with the care and tracing of living refugees and their relatives living or deceased. The National Tracing Bureaux, on the other hand, are seeking to establish what would be a service which would provide Home Governments with records and documentation on residence and employment within Germany of their citizens during the war years, for the purpose of establishing eligibility or non-eligibility for government benefits and for other legal documentations not primarily of a tracing nature.

The National Tracing Bureaux representatives, with the exception of the "Directeur General du Commissariat Belge au Repatriement", were under the impression that the operations required would be of a year or two's duration."

Mr. Martini also urged the members of the Conference to make representations to assure the re-location of CTB at Berlin.

It was later found, however, that accommodation in Berlin was absolutely impossible to secure, and it was therefore eventually decided, in spite of everything, to leave the Central Tracing Bureau at Arolsen.

(3rd July 1947).

8. CONCLUDING REMARK

There is one major question which has been posed by the circumstances and manner in which UNRRA's tracing responsibilities in Germany may have been partially demobilized. It is the question whether a Central Tracing Bureau was ever required and whether it would not, in the circumstances, have been better if the respective Zone Tracing Bureaux had led an entirely autonomous existence to that of any National Tracing Bureau.