

from being politically compatible with ours. The question which confronted the Government was whether to insist on peace or nothing, knowing that in fact that was not nothing. There was room for examining a course which, though not certain, contained a certain hope, with minimal hazards, and could lead to a process which would change the situation and eventually lead to more serious talks.

T. Toubi (Rakah): Peace, of course. But you, with your annexation plans, destroy it and prevent it. That is the historical truth.

The Prime Minister, Y. Rabin: I repeat, peace today, on the conditions which I foresee, within borders which I foresee and with a certain solution for the Palestinian problem, does not exist. What does one do, then? Should one take a risk...and go towards the principal country, because if there is a chance of a change in the Arab world the key is a change in Egypt—

(From the floor: If there won't be peace, what are you aiming at?)

On a front where the strategic depth is very great, I believe that that approach is justified, despite the risks involved. I believe that in order to check this one needs time, because we are talking about a process. Thus, the point of departure for this approach...is to create conditions which will, in the long run, make it possible to deal with the comprehensive solution of the problem by negotiations, and to examine this process continually...Within this framework the Government has also reached a series of understandings with the U.S. This is a move which regards the shift from war to peace as a process which needs to be examined both verbally and on the ground, and first of all on the Egyptian-Israeli front...That is what the Government is proposing that the Knesset approve....

M. Wertman (Ma'arach): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, on behalf of the Alignment, National Religious Front, Independent Liberals and MK Halevy, I propose that the Knesset approve the following motion: "The Knesset endorses the Agreement between Egypt and Israel, together with its appendices, which the Prime Minister, Yitzhak Rabin, has brought before the Knesset today, 3 September 1975."

The Vote

Those in favor	70
Those against	43
Abstentions	7

(MK Wertman's proposal is adopted.)

U.N. "Zionism is Racism" Resolution

Introduction

The rapid increase in the number of new nations joining the U.N., the increasing identification of the Soviet Union with the Arab Bloc and the institutionalization of the voting in the General Assembly of the U.N. brought about a gradual deterioration in Israel's parliamentary position in the Assembly. Resolutions condemning Israel or Israeli policy abounded from the 1950s onwards. In fact, they became a matter of routine, and little or no attention was paid to them by Israel's media and public opinion, or for that matter by media elsewhere. A watershed was reached, however, when on November 9—by coincidence the anniversary of *Kristallnacht*, the night on which, in 1938, the Nazis in Germany and Austria had burned most synagogues, killed and maimed scores and detained many thousands of Jews—the U.N. adopted by a two-thirds majority a resolution equating Zionism with racism, which in essence tried to deligitimize the very existence of Israel as a sovereign state.

In a rare show of near unanimity, the Knesset rejected that resolution, as well as two others, adopted simultaneously, concerning the PLO and its presence at the Geneva Conference.

Sitting 224 of the Eighth Knesset

11 November 1975 (7 Kislev 5736)

The Prime Minister, Y. Rabin: Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, yesterday the majority at the U.N. Assembly, serving Arab hostility, voted against the Jewish people, Zionism and the State of Israel. The majority at the Assembly approved resolutions which are factually and historically false, condemning Israel as a "racist state in occupied Palestine," and defining Zionism as "racism and racial discrimination." The prologue to the resolutions calls on all countries "to oppose that racist and imperialist ideology." Prior to that the Assembly approved two resolutions calling for the participation of the terrorist organization known as the PLO in the Geneva Conference and the establishment of a committee to supervise the implementation of those hostile resolutions.

By those three resolutions...the majority at the Assembly extended political support to the enemies of the Jewish people and the State of Israel who seek to undermine its moral, ideological and legal basis. By condemning Zionism as a supposedly racist theory, the people who initiated

the resolution seek to deprive Israel of its right to exist, which is the result of the independent liberation movement of the Jewish people—Zionism.

We must not delude ourselves. This is not an abstract ideological debate, but a significant attack with clear political objectives, and as such it is unprecedented in the history of the struggle we have been engaged in for several decades. The aim of the Arab representatives and their supporters is to set Israel outside the pale and invalidate its very existence in order to prepare the political conditions for intensifying the struggle against Israel as an independent country and prepare the ground for the establishment of an Arafat-led state on Israel's ruins....

The resolutions...are barren in terms of *realpolitik*. Their content and timing stand in complete contradiction to the positive trend embodied in the Interim Agreement between Israel and Egypt. Progress towards peace and the solution of the conflict in our region, including the Palestinian problem, cannot be attained in the way indicated by the U.N. Assembly. Progress towards peace and the solution of the various problems is possible, but only while respecting the rights, existence, vocations and security of Israel. We will continue to follow that path despite bitter disappointments and the selfish appeasement of wealth and oil-producers.

I said yesterday that Israel rejects those resolutions completely and will not cooperate with anything arising from them....Israel will not participate in the Geneva Conference or in negotiations in any other forum to which representatives of the PLO's murderous organization, whose declared aim is to destroy Israel, are invited. Israel does not recognize the committee set up at the Assembly yesterday and will not cooperate with it.

What regimes rule in the Arab countries which initiated the resolution condemning Zionism and what moral right do they have to decide on matters of human and national rights? They are all countries which, since becoming independent, have been characterized by persecution, torture and even the destruction of minorities and ethnic groups within their territory. Independence in Iraq began with the massacre of the Assyrian minority. In recent times Iraq has tormented the Kurdish minority, causing massive bloodshed. In Sudan the black tribes of the south have been slaughtered for years. In Egypt the Coptic minority has been accorded second-class status, and everyone remembers the treatment meted out to the inhabitants of the Gaza Strip when it was under Egyptian rule. Syria has always gloried in persecuting its minorities. Saudi Arabia still trades in slaves. In Lebanon the Maronite Christians are still fighting to survive. That is the true portrait and the moral mandate of the Arab countries which initiated those resolutions at the U.N. Assembly.

As for the PLO, which is invited to give its views on bringing peace to the Middle East, let it suffice to quote a few passages from its Manifesto: "Armed struggle is the only way to liberate Palestine and is therefore a strategy, not a tactic." "The liberation of Palestine is a national duty in order to repel the imperialist Zionist invasion from the great Arab homeland and purge Palestine of Zionist existence." "Claims as to the historical or spiritual bond between the Jews and Palestine are incompatible with historical truths." "Zionism is merely a virulently racist, aggressive movement which is expansionistcolonialist in its aims and fascist and Nazi in its means."

Who supported this base initiative? An examination of the list of countries which supported the resolution condemning Zionism reveals that it includes several countries whose regimes are dictatorial or totalitarian and whose histories are full of tyranny, repression and the disregard for human rights and dignity. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the resolutions make no mention of human, religious and social freedoms, knowing the initiators' own deficiencies in those areas.

We may draw encouragement from the countries which opposed the anti-Israel initiative...each one of which has a past which is distinguished by the ceaseless struggle for human freedom and national rights. They are enlightened democracies which have on more than one occasion fought against attempts to subordinate and subject man and society in the name of racist and reactionary theories....Once again it has been proved that the attitude of societies and people to the Jewish people is one of the touchstones of their enlightenment.

This is not the first time that November 10 has marked a significant event in the history of the Jewish people. Yesterday was the anniversary of *Kristallnacht* (the pogrom of 9 November 1938) in Nazi Germany....It is also the date on which the majority in the U.N. struck a mortal blow at the U.N. itself....By supporting this Arab scheme the U.N. has lost whatever moral and political validity it had, becoming the arena for clashes which have nothing to do with the principles and ideals for which it was established. Israel will not be the victim of these resolutions. It is the U.N. which has set itself beyond the pale...of universal principles....

There is no greater historical and moral distortion than what happened last night at the U.N. Assembly. The nation which throughout the generations has been the victim of racist persecution which is unparalleled in the history of mankind was once again the object of despicable attacks by benighted regimes. There is no greater and crueller irony than branding Zionism, which represents the struggle of an ancient nation for freedom in its land from the time our ancestors left ancient Egypt to this very day, and the nation which has contributed more than any other to the values of human freedom, as racist.

This requires the Jewish people in the diaspora and Israel to draw some basic conclusions. I call on the Jewish people in the diaspora to stand up to the plot against us, because Zionism, Judaism, the State of Israel and the Jewish people are all one and the same. At the basis of Jewish belief lies the link with the Land of Israel and the return to Zion...I call on the Jewish communities to make a greater effort to assure the welfare and future of the nation and State of Israel. I call on the entire Jewish nation to deepen Jewish consciousness, cultivate Jewish values and traditions and identify fully with the Jewish state. Today more than ever all Jews are responsible for one another. I call on Jewish youth throughout the world to immigrate to Israel and join us in fulfilling the Zionist vision.

I call on the nation in Zion to rise to the challenge before us. The attacks on Zionism and the Jewish state oblige us to reexamine our way of life and increase private and public efforts to fortify the State of Israel. Today more than ever we must rise above individual selfishness and comfort and devote ourselves completely to the objectives of Zionism. To those who rose up against us yesterday at the U.N. I say: we are no longer a helpless community. We are no longer a weak and frightened people. We are no longer despairing and hopeless. Something has happened since *Kristallnacht*. The Jewish nation now stands erect. The State of Israel has come into being. The State of Israel is firm, confident and strong. The State of Israel and its nation have decided once and for all to ensure that henceforth and forever "Israel shall dwell in safety in its land."

S.Z. Abramov (Likud): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, for many years now the U.N. has not been favorably disposed towards us and many of its resolutions have caused us pain. But the three resolutions approved yesterday...constitute a nadir which we should regard as a turning-point, and this may also apply to the very existence and function of the U.N. The two operative resolutions should be regarded merely as a calculated effort to foil the tentative progress towards peace....The decision to invite the PLO to the Geneva Conference and set up a committee to restore the Palestinians their rights constitutes an attempt to impose the authority of the Assembly on the Security Council and foil the peace process we all desire.

The Arabs and their friends have succeeded on more than one occasion in acting contrary to the U.N. Charter, as they did when they expelled Formosa and suspended South Africa....Anyone who listened to the speeches of the Arabs could not help feeling that even the supposedly moderate ones among them are not sincerely interested in peace. Egypt's attitude...raises doubts as to its true intentions, and may even run counter to the spirit of the recent agreement between it and Israel. Anyone who heard Sadat's statements in the U.S. about Zionism and Judaism cannot help thinking that this is a man who is consumed by

anti-Semitism. I think that our reply must be unequivocal: we will not go to Geneva to sit with the PLO and we will not cooperate with the U.N. in implementing the resolution about restoring the rights of the Palestinians. We will go to Geneva on the basis of Resolution 338 as we interpret it.

The debate on Zionism was one of the strangest in the history of the U.N. The U.N. is a political institution and should discuss political issues. But for three weeks it debated a subject as abstract, philosophical and historical as Zionism, as if it was debating the nature of Socialism....It was a strange mixture of Alice in Wonderland and something by Kafka. But the debate also revealed the true face of the U.N., and may even have benefited us indirectly. First of all, the resolution on Zionism united the Jewish world, and how encouraging it was to find organizations which had formerly termed themselves non-Zionist or anti-Zionist entering the fray against that resolution, for with their healthy Jewish instincts they realized that it was based on anti-Semitism....

We owe a debt of gratitude to the U.S., whose representative at the U.N. reinforced the assertion that the attempt to equate Zionism with racism stems from anti-Semitism....The 35 countries which voted for us are the democratic countries. The 72 which voted against us all have regimes of tyranny and dictatorship, whether black, red or yellow... and are seeking, by the supposedly democratic means of their majority in the U.N., to impose their doctrines and concepts on the free world.... We can only regret the fact that three-quarters of the countries of the world do not have democratic regimes and that the countries of black Africa have jumped on that bandwagon....

We can only conclude that the U.N. is an anti-Semitic institution...but it is anti-American and anti-the West to an equal extent...which is one of the absurdities of the twentieth century....The Americans have begun to realize what the situation involves, and have started acting accordingly, initially with regard to UNESCO....I regard it as our duty as Jews, as free men, as members of the free world, to reveal and to help reveal the true face of the U.N. to intellectuals and the whole world....

The fight against our right to independent existence in this country is part of the fight of the forces of evil in the world against the free world. We must stress the idea that a blow at us is a blow at the whole free world. The debate on Zionism served as a touchstone for the true division of forces within the U.N., and although we are all grieved by the resolution...we must regard it as the reflection of a disease currently afflicting most countries, and we can be proud to be part of the minority upon whose banner flies freedom and human dignity....I am sure that the Jewish people throughout the diaspora will stand up to defend its dignity, and that the countries of the free world will realize that their de-

fense of Zionism commits them to take a firm stand in defending the State of Israel.

...

A. Melamed (National Religious Front): Mr. Speaker, Knesset Members, the spirit of Hitler must have hovered over the U.N. Assembly when the *Kristallnacht* resolution was adopted. Hitler's aspirations to establish a new International based on hatred of the Jews is now being fulfilled within the U.N., which was founded in order to save future generations from the ravages of the war which Hitler brought on the world....What an ironic contrast between the noble intentions of those who founded that organization and the reality of today....

I agree with the Prime Minister's analysis of the regimes of the countries which voted against us. I would just like to say a few words about the U.S.S.R. My attitude to it is known, and I have always acknowledged our debt of gratitude to it for fighting against Nazism.... But we and the U.S.S.R. should also remember that prior to that war there was a brief period...in which the U.S.S.R. tried to benefit from the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement, according to the Nazis moral, political and military advantages....The Russian people paid a heavy price in order to learn that one does not make agreements with murderers....

The U.S.S.R.'s current alliance with racist and nationalistic countries which state quite openly their intention of destroying Israel, where the victims who survived Nazism have found refuge...is the continuation of the Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement, and may even serve as a prologue to aggression by those racist countries against the civilized world, including the U.S.S.R.

What was new about Nazism was that hatred of the Jews became an official state policy...and the focal point of a new world outlook openly and unashamedly supported by politicians, scientists, writers and intellectuals, and publicized in the mass media....

The resolution adopted at the U.N. is against the U.N. itself, which is controlled today by a majority of countries whose regimes are racist and chauvinist. If a resolution against racism were adopted it would be against most of the members of the U.N. By adopting this resolution the U.N. has destroyed itself morally....I hope that we will be able to turn this defeat into triumph...and stop and think about our internal situation....There must be an end to industrial strikes and internecine strife....We can make use of that resolution to unite and strengthen the nation, reinforcing our links with the diaspora and winning friends for Israel and Zionism....We must draw the necessary conclusions from this resolution, just as we failed to do so from the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. When the U.N. Charter becomes the Nuremberg Laws we must learn from our experience of the past....

In conclusion, I would like to paraphrase Ben-Gurion and say that we will fight this resolution as if our neighbors with whom we seek

contact had not supported it, and we will fight for peace despite the U.N. resolution....To the Jewish people we say: "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper," and "Through God we shall do valiantly, for he it is that shall tread down our enemies." And to the U.N. we say: "Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand: for God is with us."

...

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the Prime Minister's statement on the vote in the U.N. on November 10 ignored the reasons which gave rise to that discussion there.

Y. Be'eri (Likud): The reasons are Arab racism and imperialism.

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): We cannot ignore the fact that—

A. Nof (Likud): Are you for the resolution or against it?

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): Listen and then you'll know. We cannot ignore the fact that the lack of peace in our region causes everincreasing tension, which could degenerate into a new conflagration whose results are difficult to predict. Most of the members of the U.N. are concerned by this situation. The principal reason for the absence of peace in our region is the Government of Israel's refusal to implement the U.N. resolutions regarding the solution of the Middle East conflict.

A. Lin (Likud): In 1947 we agreed to the Partition Plan. Who refused to accept the U.N. resolution then?

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): We are not conducting a debate about history now. Listen to what I have to say. Those resolutions involve Israel's withdrawal from the territories occupied in June 1967 and recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including its right to an independent state alongside Israel. Instead, Israel continues with its policy of force, seeking to annex land and perpetuate the occupation. The Prime Minister says we will not go to the Geneva Conference if the representatives of the Palestinians are invited.

(From the floor: What has that got to do with the resolution condemning Zionism?)

The Prime Minister has declared that Israel will not cooperate with the committee which is to be set up. Statements of that kind, in addition to Israel's policy of repression in the occupied territories, with arrests, exile and the blowing up of the homes of Arab residents...not only do not bring peace nearer but also arouse the anger and opposition of people in Israel and the whole world who love peace.

That is the background and the situation which led to the discussions and resolutions of the U.N. Assembly....The Assembly called for the participation of the PLO in all the discussions and conferences on

the Middle East held under U.N. auspices...and set up a committee to ensure the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people....

A. Lin (Likud): Within what borders?

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): We must agree to the right of the Palestinian Arab people to an independent state alongside Israel; the solution is Israel within the borders of 1967....

E. Olmert (Likud): Do you support the U.N. resolution...?

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): I am referring to all the resolutions and am speaking in the order I consider appropriate. The two resolutions are important and I am referring to them.

E. Olmert (Likud): Do you support the U.N. resolutions or not...?

The Speaker, B.Z. Keshet: Stop conducting interrogations. The speaker does not have to reply. MK Lebenbraun, kindly continue....

A. Nof (Likud): Doesn't he have to say what his position is?

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): Anyone who really wants peace should regard these resolutions, which refer to the Palestinian problem and speak of a just peace, as an opening for peace. Anyone who really wants a just peace—and there cannot be peace without taking the just rights of all the peoples and countries of the region into account—must realize that without a just solution to the problem of the Palestinian people there will not be peace in the region.

A. Nof (Likud): To say that in these circumstances indicates a sick mind.

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): The Prime Minister's statement on the resolutions referring to the rights of the Palestinians and their participation in the Geneva Conference strikes a blow at Israel's right to exist and harms the state. The Prime Minister claims that all the 101 countries which voted for the participation of the Palestinians in the Geneva Conference oppose the existence of the State of Israel. The truth is, however, that all the countries which favor the Geneva Conference with the participation of Israel and all the parties concerned, including the Palestinians, support the existence of Israel.

Y. Be'eri (Likud): Including the PLO, which you recognize and regard as the leader of the Palestinian Arab people.

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): What does it mean if the PLO is prepared to sit with Israel at the Geneva Conference? It means that it recognizes the existence of Israel. Try to think logically. What national interest is there in representing all those countries as being against Israel's existence...?

A. Nof (Likud): First one has to know the truth....

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): But not only most of the countries of the world are in favor of the rights of the Palestinians. If you want to exist and live here you cannot deprive the neighboring people of its right....Anyone who thinks logically and wants to live in this part of the world must realize that we must reach a just settlement with the neighboring people....Hysteria and incitement are not enough.

D. Koren (Alignment): How dare you speak of hysteria and incitement?

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): Anyone who wants to live here must see things as they really are....In the end you will have to sit with the Palestinians. Why do you have to wait for U.S. pressure to do it...? The central problem is to find a just solution to the problem of the Palestinian people and recognize its right to an independent state. The continuation of Israel's policy of power and the disregard for those rights not only arouses the opposition of most of the countries of the world...but also harms Israel's existence and security.

Y. Moda'i (Likud): They can't tell us what to do, as you well know.

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): It is an unrealistic policy which harms Israel....

A. Nof (Likud): The fact that that resolution was adopted with that majority proves that even when the whole world is against us we are in the right.

Y. Be'eri (Likud): No, Iraq and Abu Dhabi are right.

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): With regard to the resolution which regards Zionism as a form of racism and discrimination, we expressed our opinion during the debate in the Knesset on the Government's statement concerning the decision of the U.N. committee. We said then that the discussions at the U.N. Assembly were held at a time when inside Israel the policy of national discrimination and repression against the Arab population was increasing. Plans have been prepared for the expropriation of the rest of the land of the Arab citizens of Israel.

E. Olmert (Likud): Why don't you say that you support the U.N. resolution? That, at least, would be quicker.

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): The plan to Judaize Galilee and establish and expand Jewish settlements while choking Arab villages is being executed. These and many other things shock everyone with a conscience in Israel and the civilized nations of the world. The subject which should be occupying the Knesset is how to remove the threat of war from our heads, attain a just peace and prevent further bloodshed and vic-

tims, additional widows and orphans. There is today a realistic possibility of reaching a just peace.

Y. Moda'i (Likud): Of submitting.

A. Lebenbraun (Rakah): The Government of Israel should abandon its policy of force and annexation and take the course of peace. It must declare its readiness to go to the Geneva Conference with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestinians, under the auspices of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R., with the object of attaining a just peace on the basis of the U.N. resolutions....That policy will bring Israel out of its isolation in the international arena and guarantee the peaceful existence of Israel and all the peoples and countries of the region.

A. Nof (Likud): MK Lebenbraun, you haven't answered the question whether you are for the resolution or against it....

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset, the U.N. resolutions are, without a doubt, an indication of the degeneration of an organization which was established with great hopes after the dreadful devastation suffered by the world. It is an indication of degeneration to a point from which there may be no return....By these resolutions the U.N. has not contributed anything to the need to advance the cause of peace in the region. By these resolutions the U.N. revealed negligence and submission to pressure. But I am careful not to include the 35 countries in the term U.N....

I suggest that most of us are united in thinking that the U.N. resolutions have not brought peace nearer....It is evident that what was done, was done under pressure and not out of any good intention of advancing the cause of peace. Nonetheless, we must not conclude that the U.N. is played out because it is our duty to hope that that organization, which was established at an important time, will continue to exist. 35 democratic countries who are by no means small fry voted with us...and believe, as we do, that peace will not be brought to the region by submitting to the blackmail and pressure of petty despots....

It is not our standing which has been undermined but the U.N.'s. Many libels have been published about the Jews...and sometimes we even tend to believe them ourselves, up to a point....This libel is particularly base, but we cannot for a moment believe it to be true. The nation does not need to do anything in order to be able to stand erect on this score....Although the resolutions do nothing to advance peace in the region, we must react and act. We must not compete in libellous statements but must act intelligently....Our reply to the statements made in the U.N. and elsewhere of late, and which are not in the least bit peaceable, must be a bold plan put forward by the Government of Israel for peace in this region....

Y. Be'eri (Likud): And should we refrain from condemning Arab racism?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): We do not condemn individual instances of racism, we condemn racism of every kind, and I do not think there is any need to argue on this point....By calling one another racists we will not get anywhere. We should show—

Y. Be'eri (Likud): Why should we always be on the defensive? Why shouldn't we attack for once?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): I think a bold plan for peace in the region is the best attack, the most political and the wisest way by which we can attack the war-mongers.

E. Olmert (Likud): Doesn't the Arab initiative lead you to certain conclusions about agreements?

Y. Be'eri (Likud): Do they want peace?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): I have never said that they want peace or believed in angels of peace who would bring peace to the region. I believe that if they could destroy us they would, and colleagues on a certain side would expel the Palestinians if they could.

E. Olmert (Likud): That is idle chatter which there is no need for now.

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): I propose that we do not restrict the freedom of expression and thought in democratic Israel. We wanted a population exchange, the existence of twenty other countries was mentioned. If we could have, we would have acted in that direction.

E. Olmert (Likud): Maybe you would have, but why attribute that to others?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): The sides realize that they cannot continue fighting one another.

E. Olmert (Likud): Which sides?

S. Aloni (Citizens' Rights Movement): As a reply to that attack we must propose our own peace plan, rather than hurling their epithets back at them. We must face our own fate today. And when the Government asks the public to display unity, it must set an example, cut its own budget and lead the country wisely and well....Above all, it must understand that, despite attacks from outside, we continue to be a democratic society and have no need to ban plays, movies, newspapers or TV programs in the name of public morale. The morale of the Jewish public in Israel and abroad is not harmed. All we received was a warning signal, an indication that we are on our own, and I have no doubt that if we can only free ourselves of our verbal games, feelings of revenge and inappro-

prate style, we can mobilize additional forces, both in the world and in that declining institution, and cause a different spirit to prevail....

...

M. Wertman (Alignment): Mr. Speaker, distinguished Knesset...on behalf of the Alignment, Likud, National Religious Front, Independent Liberals, Citizens' Rights Movement and MK Halevy, I propose the following concluding resolution:

The Knesset rejects the resolutions adopted on 10 November 1975 by the U.N. Assembly condemning Zionism and the State of Israel. The Knesset determines that those resolutions encourage Israel's enemies in hindering peace. The Knesset determines that Israel will not recognize the committee to be set up and will not cooperate with it....

The Knesset determines that the organization known as the PLO is a framework for murderous organizations whose declared aim is the destruction of Israel. Israel will not conduct negotiations with the terrorist organizations in any forum and will not participate in the Geneva Conference if those organizations are invited to it. The Knesset calls on the Jewish people in the diaspora to increase immigration to Israel and all Zionist activities, and to support Israel in implementing its Zionist objectives. The Knesset expresses its gratitude to all the countries which voted against those shameful resolutions at the U.N. Assembly.

(MK Wertman's concluding resolution is adopted.)

Israel's Responsibility for and Policy towards Diaspora Jewry

Introduction

The relationship between Israel and Jews living abroad and, by the same token, the implications of Israel's character as a Jewish state have been fundamental issues echoed in many debates in the Knesset. They have, however, only seldom constituted the focus of a special debate. A motion for the agenda on the subject was presented by MK Geula Cohen on 26 November 1975, and was followed later on by a full-scale debate.

Sitting 231 of the Eighth Knesset

26 November 1975 (22 Kislev 5736)

G. Cohen (Likud): Distinguished Knesset, despite the Knesset's low labor morals...I hope things have not reached such a pass that I have to ask the House to forgive me for raising a purely Zionist issue...and asking whether we are still a Zionist state....

In effect, what happened yesterday, when Jews who sought to settle in Judea and Samaria were removed, is sufficient indication...its ultimate implication being the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank...and the condemnation of Zionism not only by our enemies. But today I will discuss Zionism from a different angle...that of the Jewish people, and ask to what extent the Government of Israel, as a Zionist government, is responsible for the fate of the entire Jewish people and is prepared to accept whatever derives from that and, accordingly, to appoint a Minister whose sole responsibility will be the Jewish people.

The only Jewish community...which cannot concern itself with the welfare of the Jewish people is the Jewish community in the State of Israel. In Israel's Knesset, which represents Israel's citizens, there is no possibility today of seriously discussing a topic connected with the Jews of the diaspora, whether it be immigration or Jewish education, assimilation or anti-Semitism, because there is no Minister in the Government who deals with the subject....

That is no mere chance. The subject of the Jewish people does not appear on the agenda of the Knesset because it does not appear on the agenda of the State of Israel. The phenomenon I am referring to has its roots in a fundamental error...committed in the early years of the state's existence, when it decided not to take upon itself the responsibil-