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

In the 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 all-powerful and essential, the security of both Israel and the Arab States. As was President Johnson, therefore, I was disturbed when Secretary General Thant's precipitate action has, in itself, altered the status quo in the Middle East.

Indeed, the Israelis evacuated the Sinai Peninsula and the Gaze Strip in 1957 only on the condition that the United Nations Emergency Force be continued in these areas. This mission has served the cause of peace by acting as a buffer between the United Arab Republic and Israel in these sensitive areas.

Today, it is time to demonstrate reason and no passions of bitter memories.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution to be printed in the Near East situation at this point in the record.

The Near East situation, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Near East situation, May 23, 1967.

In recent days, tension has again arisen among the armistice lines between Israel and the Arab States. The situation has a matter of very grave concern to the whole international community. We earnestly support all efforts, and in outside the United Nations and through its appropriate organs, including the Secretary-General, to reduce tensions and to restore stability. The Secretary-General's actions to the Near East on his mission of peace. I call upon all concerned to observe in a spirit of restraint their solemn responsibilities under the United Nations and the General Assembly charters.

Mr. DIKSEN, Mr. President, I listened to the President last night and his message this morning. It was thought that his message was all inclusive and underscored the essential things we have to have in mind with respect to the Middle East situation. It is to the danger, how crucial it really is, and how strategic this area is with respect to the stability of a global peace. The situation is a matter of great concern and we support the United Nations and the General Assembly charters.

I think the statement was bipartisan, and I think the President was speaking for both Republicans and Democrats that are committed to the principles on which the United Nations was founded—certain fundamental principles.

The most basic of these deeply held principles is that no nation has the right to use its military power for aggression or external 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
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fighting and dying right now in the jungles and the hills of the free world. Problems cannot be settled by aggression.

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

When President John F. Kennedy called upon the United Nations to exercise its rightful role in maintaining stability, that is the reason it was created. There was such a glowing preamble to 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 him I am utterly dismayed by the action of Secretary General Thant in suddenly, without warning or discussion, ordering the United Nations peacekeeping force to retreat from its positions in Ceylon and Greece.

We have heard a good deal, from Secretary General Thant and others, about the need for effective peacekeeping forces, and that now where they have acted effectively for a decade, the United Nations Emergency Forces has slipped into a chival in the night, upon the determination of the majority leader, and the majority leader will be extremely helpful.

I thoroughly approve of the statement made yesterday by President Johnson in the executive session, in which he clearly sets forth the attitude and policy of the United States. I wish to refer to the words which the President used in relation to the question of what he expects from the United States in the Near East crisis and to the words used by John Foster Dulles in his pledge to the Senate as to the State of Israel is a fundamental tenant 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 part of the world. The President's quotation is:

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

That is practically a paraphrase of the statement made by Secretary Dulles, except that President Johnson extended it to the whole area, which is quite proper and understandable. Moreover, it indicates a continuity of American foreign policy which is critically important for President Nasser 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 text of their statement of yesterday clearly shows where they stand. Undoubtedly it was intended to encourage not to discourage Mr. Nasser. Their text was issued at the same time President Johnson issued his.

In my opinion, the leaders of the Soviet Union are misjudging one thing; namely, that this country will shrink from its responsibility and obligations because it is engaged in Vietnam.

Mr. President, to use a popular expression, there is no use whatever in "tipping our hand" to the Russians or to the Nasserites as to what we will do to protect the interests of all mankind and the Near East. I would not use this in your business. We do not have to give them notice about it. This Nation is big enough, strong enough, and determined enough in terms of protecting world peace and all mankind, that it can do without notice.

There is no necessity for including or excluding any means, whether it be a military posture, the complete position of our Nations, or the actions of one or more 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 paralyzed—and I hope they are 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. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. If I may finish this thought first. But let me take this opportunity to say to him that I was present all through the Foreign Relations Committee executive session of the Membership of the Senate yesterday, and I have heard disingenuousness as a substitute for what the Senator from Tennessee was responsible for.

To finish my thought there, there is one further point I should like to make as to the statement of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Masters). I have had his words repeated to me as taken down, that there was no question of unilateral 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 assume the Russians or President Nasser as to our options. I see no need whatever to do that. The majority leader is absolutely right that at this point there has to be a decision on unilateral action. What the United States will do in its business, right now, it is doing its utmost through the United Nations and the other powers to the tripitarian past—France and the United Kingdom—and in calling upon the whole international community which by crossing its own waterways 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 point out that the rulers in the Kremlin will again misinterpret, as President Nasser has misinterpreted, if they underestimate the determination of this Nation to show in the world that there is peace and order in the world.

They will misinterpret if they seek to take advantage of an opportunity when a great power is engaged elsewhere. This is not the time for them. In view of the statement of the President of the United States, which, as shown by the majority leader, is clearly head of the full backing of Congress. I believe