

accept an international regime for Jerusalem because in practice its Jewish inhabitants had found that their safety depended on the armed forces of Israel.

Conciliation Commission Proposals

In drawing up its detailed plan for an international regime for Jerusalem the Conciliation Commission took into account the armistice agreement of April 3, 1949, between Jordan and Israel, which confirmed the demarcation line of November 30, 1948, running through the city of Jerusalem. The Conciliation Commission proposed in September 1949 that Arab and Jewish zones in Jerusalem should be recognized, that Arab and Jewish authorities should provide the day-to-day municipal administration in their respective zones and that a mixed appointive body should look after services of common interest, such as transportation and communication. A United Nations Commissioner would assure the observance of human rights, the protection of holy places and freedom of access to these places and supervise the demilitarization of the Jerusalem area. An international tribunal would settle disputes involving the holy places, as well as disputes between Arab and Jewish authorities. A mixed court would hear cases between private individuals. 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.

General Assembly Proposals

When the General Assembly of the United Nations took up the Jerusalem issue in November 1949 several delegations offered proposals for Jerusalem which received more attention than the plan of the Conciliation Commission. Broadly speaking these additional plans represented three schools of thought. Some members desired full United Nations control of an undivided Jerusalem area. At the other extreme were those who argued that Israel and Jordan should exercise full sovereignty in the area, signing agreements with the United Nations concerning safeguards they would themselves provide for the protection of holy places. A third group of states proposed a modified form of internationalization, to safeguard religious interests of the outside world in Jerusalem while at the same time giving the occupying powers as large a degree of secular control as was thought to be consistent with the full protection of religious interests.

Votes were taken on the issue first in sub-committee, then in a main committee and finally in a plenary meeting of the Assembly itself. At each stage a draft proposal for full internationalization was put to the vote first and was adopted by more than the required majority. Few members were prepared to recognize the full sovereignty of the occupying powers. There was more support for the proposals for modified or so-called "functional" internationalization, but these were not put to the vote and the support they might have commanded was thus never tested. Canada, which advocated "functional" internationalization, abstained in the first two stages of voting. In the third stage—i.e., in the final vote in the Assembly—Canada voted against complete internationalization of Jerusalem, for reasons which are indicated below.

Israel and Jordan both opposed vigorously the principle of internationalization of the Jerusalem area. Both states were willing to guarantee the pro-