

# **Trips: Trips - 29**

*HS L 179:70*



Dag Hammarskjöld's samt.

D. H. trips 1956 April 23

Israel - Syria Problems (Points dealt with in the conversation  
with Ben-Gurion (Prime Min. of Israel))

At Damascus, 23 April 1956

ISRAEL-SYRIA PROBLEMS

Points dealt with in the conversation  
with Mr. Ben-Gurion, on Friday morning, 20 April

1. Jordan Canal Project

2. Crew of the Syrian boat "Faical"

They will be returned within a few days by the Israelis together with the boat. (Delay was, according to Mr. Tekoah, "purely technical". It was due to the fact that the boat had to be repaired.) - Israel hopes that UNTSO will continue to use its good offices to obtain the return of certain Israelis who, it is alleged, are still in Syria (but this is not a condition which will prevent the return of the crew of the "Faical").

3. Lake Tiberias

(a) General Burns' suggestions

Mr. Ben-Gurion agreed that this question "should be settled on the basis of common sense, and not as necessitating a change in the General Armistice Agreement".

Suggestion (c). The Israelis made it clear that "drawing water" would be for domestic purposes (already accepted by the Syrians).

Suggestion (e), accepted by Mr. Ben-Gurion with the reservation of the right to send boats close to shore in case of attack - or in an emergency (e.g. for the rescue of another boat). If Israeli boats come to shore, the Syrians should not shoot at them but complain. Israeli police would get strict orders not to approach shore.

4. Resumption of MAC Meetings

Israel agrees to the resumption of emergency meetings. The difficulty in connection with the resuming of regular meetings still exists. (Mr. Tekoah explained it was difficult to agree to the MAC interpreting Article V while Syria refused to implement other provisions - particularly Article VIII.)

General Dayan referred to the situation in the Demilitarized Zone, where Israeli settlements were part of Israel, and some Arab villages were under Syrian control. A re-activation of the MAC and a return to the Armistice regime would not improve the situation.

The Secretary-General proposed to resume the activities of the MAC without commitment as to what would be discussed.

Master File

SECRET

At Jerusalem  
20 April 1956

A I D E - M E M O I R E

( for personal use only)

Concerning Banat Yakoub, I declared to Mr. Ben-Gurion that my stand with the Syrians would be as follows:

The cease-fire obligation (in Syrian Agreement under Article III, 2 and 3) is an undisputed obligation which is not cancelled through non-compliance by the other Party with any other clause of the Armistice Agreement.

Thus, use of force can never be justified by Israeli action in what the Syrians consider to be contravention of their legal rights in the case of Banat Yakoub.

The resolution of the Security Council cannot be interpreted by me, but only by the Security Council. 1/

Thus, my stand on the Canal issue must be that I must request both Parties to abide by decisions of the Security Council and taken under the General Armistice Agreement.

---

1/ This, in fact, means that it must be assumed as remaining valid until the Security Council interprets the word "urgent" as indicating a determined time-limit. (This is my conclusion, which was not stated explicitly at the table.)