

between Arab and Jewish authorities. A mixed court would hear cases involving private individuals in each zone and outsiders. Neither Jews nor Arabs might establish their capital in Jerusalem, and the proportion of Jews to Arabs in the area was not to be altered.

The Conciliation Commission reported that it had invited the governments of Israel and the Arab states to sign a draft declaration concerning protection of Holy Places outside the Jerusalem area. This specified that the United Nations Commissioner in Jerusalem should supervise the fulfilment of guarantees given by the states concerned, while disputes relating to Holy Places outside Jerusalem would be referred to the international tribunal which was to be set up in Jerusalem. The Arab states drafted and signed a modified declaration giving most of the desired guarantees, but omitting all reference to the United Nations Commissioner in Jerusalem and the proposed international tribunal. Israel, which objected to the same features, merely indicated its willingness to offer guarantees for protection of Holy Places outside Jerusalem after the Assembly had reached a decision on the Jerusalem regime itself.

The plan offered by the Conciliation Commission received less attention than a series of draft proposals offered by individual delegations to the Assembly. Broadly speaking the proposals of member states represented three attitudes. Some wanted full United Nations control of an undivided Jerusalem area along the lines of the first Assembly resolution of November 1947. At the other extreme were those who argued that Israel and Jordan were quite capable of protecting the Holy Places and that they should be allowed to exercise full sovereignty in the area, although they would be expected to enter into agreements with the United Nations concerning the safeguards they would provide. A third group of states proposed a modified form of internationalization, to safeguard religious interests of the outside world in Jerusalem, while allowing the occupying powers as much secular control as was consistent with the full protection of religious interests.

Israel and Jordan both vigorously opposed the principle of internationalization of the Jerusalem area and intimated that they would resist its imposition. Few other states seemed to be prepared, however, to recognize the full sovereignty of the occupying powers. There was more support for the proposals for modified or so-called "functional" internationalization, but in all stages—in sub-committee, in full committee and in the plenary meeting of the Assembly—the plan for full internationalization was put to the vote first and was adopted by more than the required majorities.

The proposal for full internationalization adopted by the Assembly on December 9, 1949, by a vote of 38 to 14 with 7 abstentions was drafted by Australia and amended by El Salvador, the Soviet Union, and Lebanon.* Thirteen of the twenty Latin American states gave it their support, as did three Western European states, the five members of the Soviet bloc and the six Arab members of the United Nations, who, for various reasons, did not wish to see either Israel or Jordan in full possession of Jerusalem. Jordan, though participating in the discussions, had no vote, since a Soviet veto has prevented its admission to membership in the Organization. Among the fourteen members who opposed the resolution were the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, South Africa and the Scandinavian states. Among the seven which abstained were New Zealand, the Netherlands and Chile.

*For the text of the resolution, see Appendix 15, pp. 259-260.