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Congen's 316

You may inform French C den that you have consulted Department and
ascertained there has been no rpt no change in U.S. attitude toward status
of Jerusalem. You may wish to note that our views appear to parallel his
own.

Emb Paris should not rpt not take initiative this matter but if
subject raised by GOV Emb should respond along above lines.
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Lucet said for consideration by the Security Council (inappropiate to mention present) to the joint commission. He
was to go to Rome today to meet with Dodi. He recalled that the
Sehecarter would probably sends four corresponding in the
nature of instructions to discuss with them in the Moscow at
CIS. He leaves for Brussels with President Mendizal due
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ARGENTINA: President Stroessner arrived in Buenos Aires on November 22nd. He met with President Peron at the presidential residence. They discussed various matters, including the possibility of a joint Argentine-Brazilian economic agreement. Stroessner expressed interest in the Brazilian development project and the potential for increased trade between the two nations. The meeting lasted for approximately three hours. The discussions were confidential and no press releases were issued. Stroessner remained in Buenos Aires for two days before returning to Asuncion. The trip was made at the invitation of President Peron.

[REDACTED]
PROPOSITION RETURN OF EICHMANN TO ARGENTINE EMB WITH TOUGHER ESPECIALLY CONSTITUTED INTERNATIONAL COURT TO DECIDE WHAT SHOULD BE DONE WITH HIM. ESHEL SAID ANY RETURN OF EICHMANN TO ARGENTINE CUSTODY UNDER WHICH ISRAEL NOT ASSURED OF HIS SUBSEQUENT RETURN TO ISRAELI CONTROL WAS UNACCEPTABLE TO ISRAELIS.

4. ESHEL SAID ISRAEL WAS PREPARED MAKE AMENDS TO ARGENTINA BUT NOT TO GIVE EICHMANN BACK. HE THOUGHT THEY WOULD BE PREPARED TO MAKE TOKEN MONETARY REPARATION SUCH AS PAYING FIVE HUNDRED OR ONE THOUSAND ISRAELI POUNDS. IF CASE WENT TO ICJ GENERAL RES. ALONG LINES ADOPTED IN VIETNAM CASE WOULD BE MOST THAT SHOULD BE DONE. HE DID NOT SEE HOW SC MEMBERS POSSIBLY COULD VOTE FOR RES CALLING FOR RETURN OF EICHMANN TO ARGENTINA IN LIGHT ARGENTINE RECORD IN HARBORING NAZIS AND REFUSING EXTRADITION OF SIMILAR CRIMINALS TO WEST GERMANY AND IN LIGHT STRONG REACTIONS THERE WOULD BE TO SUCH RES FROM SEGMENTS OF PUBLIC OPINION IN 'VARIOUS COUNTRIES'.

5. HE ALSO SAID HE DID NOT SEE HOW SC MEMBERS COULD SAY ARGENTINA HAD PROPERLY USED POSSIBILITIES OF NEGOTIATIONS CALLED FOR UNDER ART 33 OF CHARTER, ESPECIALLY AS ARGENTINES HAD GIVEN THEM 7-DAY ULTIMATUM ON RETURN OF EICHMANN AND THEN "INSOLENTLY" CALLED FOR SC SESSION. HE STRESSED THAT ISRAEL WAS PREPARED TO CONSIDER VARIOUS MEANS OF SOLVING ISSUE AS LONG AS THEY DID NOT INVOLVE TURNING EICHMANN OVER TO ARGENTINA. HE SAID ISRAEL WOULD TAKE VERY MODERATE LINE IN SC. THEY DID NOT INTEND TO REFER TO PRO-NAZI RECORD OF ARGENTINA. ALTHOUGH THEY THOUGHT OTHERS WOULD. HE ALSO ARGUED THAT ARGENTINA HAD POOR LEGAL CASE ON EICHMANN BECAUSE EICHMANN HAD NOT LEGALLY BEEN IN ARGENTINA. HE ALSO CITED CASE IN US COURTS, WHICH SC SAID HAD GONE TO SUPREME COURT, IN WHICH JURISDICTION OF US COURT WAS UPHELD EVEN THOUGH INDIVIDUAL HAD BEEN KIDNAPPED IN PERU AND BROUGHT TO US.
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