

final statement on the Near East situation. I commend the President for the tone of his remarks, the restraint in their content, and the appeal to all concerned, in effect, to "make hay while the sun still shines."

In nearly 20 years, we have looked to the United Nations for concrete implementation of the ideals of peace and stability in the Near East on the basis of the recognition of the sovereignty of both Israel and the Arab States.

As was President Johnson, therefore, I was disturbed when Secretary General Thant—without consultation with either the Security Council or the General Assembly—ordered the United Nations Emergency Force out of Sinai and the Gaza strip. For 16 years the UNCEF has served the cause of peace by acting as a buffer between the United Arab Republic and Israel in those sensitive areas.

Indeed, the Israelis evicted the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaza strip in 1957 only on the condition that the United Nations would accept jurisdiction. Thus, Secretary General Thant's pre-emptive action has, in itself, shored the status quo in the Middle East.

However, this is no time to engage in a critique of past efforts. What is important is the present and the fact that the maintenance of international order in the Near East is the responsibility of all nations.

It would be my hope that we would continue to place primary emphasis on the United Nations and at the same time, the United Kingdom and France—the latter especially—would make every possible effort to avert a showdown between Israel and the Arab States.

There should be no question of unilateral military involvement in the Near East—a position which was brought most forcefully to the attention of Secretary of State Acheson by the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday. There should be a continued and unwavering insistence that the United Nations face up to its peacekeeping and peace-making responsibilities—which have been avoided far too long—not only in the present Near East situation but also in the matter of the question which is Vietnam.

It will be of the utmost importance, Mr. President, that the U.S.S.R. and France face up to their individual and collective responsibilities on these two matters and also that the U.K. Security Council also confront these two great perils—one imminent and the other already a fact. The answer to the Near East lies not in unilateral action on the part of the U.S.S.R. or the United States; rather, if this action is called for, on a multilateral or collective basis.

In the meantime, calmness and coolness are called for. Let us move slowly and carefully and not be swept away by emotional reactions. Let us hope, above all else, that reason will prevail among all the potential antagonists to the end that the embers of the moment will not be fanned into the flames of conflict.

It is time for the governments of the Near East to turn to their primary mission: to cooperate with each other, and with other nations, to improve the life

of their peoples. I would hope that American will follow the President's calm and firm lead. There is a need to draw back from the dangerous brink. It is a time to demonstrate reason and not the passions of Hitler's successors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that remarks of the President on the Near East situation be printed at this point in the Record.

These being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
BY SENATOR JAMES EARL RUSSETT, MAY 23, 1947

In recent days, tension has again arisen along the armistice lines between Israel and the Arab States. The situation there is a matter of very grave concern to the whole international community. We earnestly support all efforts to end outside the United Nations and through its appropriate organs, the Secretary-General, to reach a settlement and to restore stability. The Secretary-General has gone to the Near East on his mission of peace with the hopes and prayers of men of good will everywhere.

The Near East links three continents, the birthplace of civilization and of three of the world's great religions. It is the home of some 100 million people, and the crossroads between East and West.

The world community has a vital interest in peace and stability in the Near East, one that has been expressed primarily through the United Nations action and continues over the past 20 years.

The United States, as a member of the United Nations, and as a nation dedicated to a world order based on law and mutual respect, has actively supported efforts to maintain peace in the Near East.

The danger, and it is a very grave danger, lies in the misinterpretation arising from a misunderstanding of the intentions and actions of others.

The Government of the United States is deeply concerned in a period in which there potentially exist aspects of the present armistice.

First, we regret that the Geneva Armistice Agreements have failed to prevent warfare acts from the territory of one against another government, or against civilians, or territory, under control of another government.

Second, we are dismayed at the hurried withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from Gaza and Sinai after more than 10 years of steadfast and effective service in keeping the peace, without action by either the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations. We continue to regard the presence of the United Nations in the area as a matter of fundamental importance. We intend to support its continuation over all possible views.

Third, we deplore the recent build-up of military forces and believe it a matter of urgent importance to reduce to minimum levels the status of sensitive areas, as the Secretary-General emphasized in his report to the Security Council, such as the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba, is a particularly important aspect of the situation.

In this connection, I want to add that the purported closing of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping has brought a new and very grave dimension to the crisis. The United States condemns the act to be an international wrong and feels that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and fundamentally inconsistent to the cause of peace. The right of free, innocent passage of the international waterway is a vital interest of the entire international community.

The Government of the United States is seeking clarification on this point. We have

already urged Secretary-General Thant to recognize the sensitivity of the Aqaba question and we have asked him to give it the highest priority in his discussions in Cairo. In the interests of all the nations of the Near East, I wish to say that those American Presidents have said before me—that the United States is firmly committed to the support of the United Nations and to the essential integrity of all the nations of that area. The United States strongly opposes aggression by anyone in the area, in any form, over the political status of the Gulf of Aqaba of the United States led by four Presidents: President Truman, President Eisenhower, President John F. Kennedy, and myself—as well as the political interests and the political peace of the entire area of the United States over the past 20 years, within and outside the United Nations, is abundantly clear on this point.

The United States has consistently sought to have good relations with all the states of the Near East. Respectably this has not always been possible, but we are convinced that relations with Israel and with the Arab and Near East States with each other must be worked out peacefully and in accordance with accepted international practice.

We have always spoken—and we speak in other parts of the world at this very moment—the efforts of other nations to resolve their problems with their neighbors by the agreement route. We shall continue to do so. And tonight we appeal to all other participating nations to do likewise.

I call upon all concerned to observe in a spirit of cordiality their solemn responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations and the General Armistice Agreements. There remains an inescapable means of promoting stability over the independent interests of the international community, a peace with justice and honor can be achieved.

I have been in close and very frequent consultation with our State and Defense officials, with our own Ambassador, Mr. Odellberg, at the United Nations, where we are now pursuing the matter with great vigor, and we hope that the Security Council can act with an effectiveness.

Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. President, I listened to the President last night and I reread his message this morning. I thought that his message was all inclusive and underscored the essential things we have to have in mind with respect to the Middle East. He pointed out the danger, how crucial it really is, and how strategic this area is with respect to at least three continents. He put his finger on the one great danger in international affairs, and that is the danger of miscalculation. He was very candid, indeed, when he spoke about the troop buildup on the other side and also scrupulously clarified on the question of whether the Gulf waters are international in character.

I think the statement was bipartisan, and I think the President was speaking for both Republicans and Democrats alike in the national interest.

For 20 years, under Presidents of both our great parties, the American people has supported—with the United Nations and elsewhere—certain fundamental principles.

The most basic of these deeply held principles is that no nation has the right to change the international map by unilateral violence. On that principle rests the difference between order and anarchy in a dangerous and feverish world. It is for that principle that our men are

fighting and drug rights now in the Pacific. International problems need to be settled by agreement.

Now we are threatened by an outbreak of aggression in the Middle East. Twenty years ago a status quo was achieved in that area, and that status quo was guaranteed not only by the Charter of the United Nations but by specific agreements and commitments undertaken by individual nations—including the United States, Great Britain, and France.

With President Johnson, I call upon the United Nations to exercise its rightful role in maintaining stability. That is the reason it was created. There was such a glowing promise in that document when it was uttered in 1945, and the emphasis was on its peacekeeping responsibilities and the maintenance of order and stability in the world. With time I am utterly dismayed by the action of Secretary General Thant in completely without warning or consultation, ordering the United Nations peacekeeping force to retreat from its positions in Cuba and Sinai.

We have heard a good deal, from Secretary General Thant and others, about the need for effective peacekeeping forces in the world. Yet, when they have acted effectively for a decade, the United Nations Emergency Force has slipped out like a thief in the night, upon the demand of one government.

Those who have tried a similar peacekeeping force on the borders of Vietnam may well be asked: What would they have done if they had a 15-hour, 24-hour, or 34-hour demand by Ho Chi Minh?

It is, however, better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. In this spirit I want to join with President Johnson and my distinguished friend, the majority leader, in calling for attention on all sides.

I was happy to note mentioned was a real tribute to the statement made by the President to the country.

Much more is at stake than the peace of the Middle East. All the nations of the world must realize that the credibility of the United Nations, the very existence of an international community—however precarious—is involved in the peaceful outcome of the present serious confrontation. Those who sow the wind shall reap the whirlwind; it is hardly necessary for me to document this ancient truth.

This is not an Arab crisis, an Israeli crisis, an Egyptian or Soviet crisis—it is a world crisis in which all those who cherish stability and order must rally to prevent hostilities.

The President has spoken for us, has expressed our goals and our determination in the case of peace and world order. Let other nations now demonstrate equally their reactions, their convictions, and their willingness to give life to these values which alone can create the future that suffering mankind deserves.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I want to speak in connection with this statement. The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Pastore) has been waiting to speak but if he will indulge me for 3 minutes I ask

that I may be recognized on my time for 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heard the views of the majority leader and the minority leader, as they spoke with their typical candor and honesty and frankness. They have stood behind the President in a very serious crisis so that neither President Nixon, of the United Arab Republic, nor anyone else may have thought as to a division in this country when it comes to bearing American responsibility and American obligations. I join those in the crowd and I don't believe this because the overwhelming attitude of the Senate and the Nation.

Mr. President, within that context, there are a few observations I wish to make. I make these observations today because I think in those early stages of this kind of international difficulty clear expressions of views may prove helpful. Certainly the views which have been expressed by the majority leader and minority leader will be extremely helpful.

I thoroughly approve of the statement made yesterday by President Johnson which, in my judgment, admirably sets forth the attitude and policy of the United States. I wish to refer to the words which the President used in relation to what he considers to be the U.S. responsibility in the Near East crisis and to the words used by John Foster Dulles in his speech to the Senate of the State of New York, a fundamental tenet of U.S. foreign policy.

The President, with great propriety, I think, has extended that principle for the whole Near East. He is absolutely right. I join him completely in that. It is not our desire or need to play favorites in that area of the world. The President is absolutely right.

The United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all of the nations of the area.

That is precisely a paraphrase of the statement by Secretary Dulles, except that President Johnson is extending it to the whole area, which is quite proper and understandable. Moreover, it includes a particular of American foreign policy which is critically important for President Nixon and the leaders in the Kremlin to understand.

It is widely estimated that the Soviet Union undoubtedly must have given considerable encouragement to Mr. Nasser in this very desperate and dangerous move. If there is any doubt about it, the tenor of their statement of yesterday clearly shows where they stand. Undoubtedly it was intended to encourage not to discourage Mr. Nasser. Their last was issued at the same time President Johnson heard him.

In my judgment, the leaders of the Soviet Union are miscalculating one thing: namely, that this country will shrivel from its responsibility and obligations because it is exposed in Vietnam. There is no one whatever in "tipping the hand" to Nasser or the Russians as to what we will do to protect the inter-

ests of all mankind and the Near East. That is our business. We do not have to give them advice about it. This Nation is big enough, strong enough, and determined enough in terms of protecting world peace so that it will find a way.

There is no necessity for indicating or indicating any means, whether it be a means, force, diplomatic action, limited military action, or the actions of one of many powers. Whatever it may be, I am confident that we will find a way.

The leaders in the Kremlin and Mr. Nasser would be extremely ill advised if they believe that they have moved at a moment when the United States is particularly—because it is not—by the situation in Vietnam. This could be a fatal mistake equal to the miscalculation the Russian leaders made in Cuba at the time of the 1962 missile crisis, when they thought we would not react. The Russians were quite wrong then and they will be quite wrong now.

Mr. COREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. If I may finish my thought first. But let me take this opportunity to say to him that I was present all through the Foreign Relations Committee executive session hearing with Secretary Dulles yesterday, and I have never heard anything as acute as that for which the Senator from Tennessee was responsible.

To finish my thought here, there is one further point I should like to make clear as to the statement of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Mansfield). I have had his words repeated to me as taken down, that there was no question of military action in the Middle East at this point.

There was no question, and there is no question of unilateral action in the Middle East, but I do not believe that we should agree the President or President Nixon as to our opinion. I see no need whatever to do that. The majority leader is absolutely right that at this point there is no question of unilateral action. What the United States will do is its business. Right now, it is doing its utmost through the United Nations, to calling upon the other powers in the tripartite partnership and the United Kingdom—and in calling upon the whole international community, which use international waters to recognize the grave threat this situation poses to everyone, including the Soviet Union.

The policy of the United States is absolutely right in that regard.

Mr. President, I make these remarks only to remind that the rules in the Kremlin will again miscalculate, so President Nixon has miscalculated. If they underestimate the determination of this Nation to see that there is peace and order in the world.

They will miscalculate if they seek to take advantage of an opportunity when a great power is engaged elsewhere. This cannot be made profitable for them. In view of the statement of the President of the United States, which, as shown by the majority and minority leaders has the full backing of Congress, I believe