

reauthorize it. That means over 121,000 workers who have submitted petitions seeking resources to improve their job skills have been ignored.

Elected officials on both sides of the aisle like to talk about supporting American workers. It is time that we put our money where our mouth is.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the American Worker and Trade Competitiveness Act and demand that it be brought to a vote.

The American people are watching. They want to know if we have their back. We cannot afford to wait any longer.

#### DEFINITION OF WOKE

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as my Republican colleagues continue to rail against everything woke and for their Project 2025 agenda.

Now, most Members don't even know what woke even means, so let me just try to lay it out. As the NAACP reminded us in a 2023 resolution, the word "woke" has been used by Black Americans even as far back as the 1940s when the Black mineworkers issued the statement: "We were asleep. But we will stay woke from now on."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this official NAACP resolution titled: "Resolution-Reclaiming the Word 'Woke' as Part of African-American Culture" be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NAACP—2023

RESOLUTION: RECLAIMING THE WORD "WOKE" AS PART OF AFRICAN AMERICAN CULTURE

Whereas, Black history is a critical aspect of American history and has shaped American culture, including the evolution of language; and

Whereas, The words "Wake Up" and "Woke" have served as a call to action as conveyed by social activist Marcus Garvey who stated, "Wake up Ethiopia! Wake up Africa", and the Negro Mine Workers who in 1940 issued the statement, "We were asleep. But we will stay woke from now on," in advocating against discriminatory pay; and

Whereas, The term "Woke" was first highlighted in the 1962 essay, "If You're Woke, You Dig It", featured in the "New York Times" by Harlem-based writer William Melvin Kelley who documented the cultural appropriation and distortion of language, resulting in certain idioms being abandoned by their original Black creators; and

Whereas, The term "Woke" has been similarly misused, as traditionally and white-focused media have reframed "Woke" as trendy new slang, eroding its cultural connection and separating the term from its historical grounding in social justice; and

Whereas, Six decades later, anti-Black racists have engaged in a similar exercise of cultural appropriation to weaponized and misdefine the term "Woke", as evidenced by the "Stop W.O.K.E. Act", specifically targeting the teaching of American history and Black educators; and

Whereas, Black educators are more likely to teach subjects that incorporate an inclusive view of history, and legislation like the "Stop W.O.K.E. Act" threatens the free speech and livelihood of teachers, and the quality of education received by all students, most recently students in Florida.

Therefore be it resolved, that the NAACP affirms the term "Woke" and its historical connection to Black history, Black liberation movements, and social justice.

Be it further resolved, that the NAACP through its units encourages a historically accurate and correct use of the term "Woke" when its misuse is identified.

Be it finally resolved, that the NAACP condemns cultural appropriation, misuse of Black idioms, and specific efforts by anti-Black racists to distort and redefine the specific term "Woke."

Ms. LEE of California. In 2010 it began to be used widely, primarily by Black Americans to bring awareness to social inequities such as racial injustice, sexism, and denial of LGBTQ+ rights.

Today, the Merriam-Webster dictionary defines "woke" as "aware of and actively attentive to important societal facts and issues, especially issues of racial and social justice."

Also, the Merriam-Webster Dictionary quotes me from a speech I gave several years ago: "We have a moral obligation to 'stay woke,' take a stand and be active; challenging injustices and racism in our communities. . . ."

#### A TWO-STATE SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise.

And still I rise today, and I stand alone. I stand alone, Mr. Speaker, because sometimes it is better to stand alone than not stand at all.

I stand today, mindful of the words of the great Voltaire, the great intellectual who reminds us that it is dangerous, Mr. Speaker, to be right in affairs where established men are wrong.

I rise today to take a stand and call to the attention of the Nation that I love, I love this country. I salute the flag. I stand for the national anthem. I sing the national anthem.

I remind everyone that the greatness of America will not be measured by whether the AL GREENS of the world will stand and sing and salute.

The greatness of America will be measured by whether the AL GREENS of the world will defend those who choose not to stand, sing, and salute, and I do. I defend them.

I believe that the greatness of the country resides in our ability to have people that we disagree with stand before us, look us in the eye, announce their disagreement, and yet, we take that understanding that in this country, we can disagree and still have a great country.

I stand today to call to the attention of the Nation and the many who may

not know, but a good many may know what I am about to share, and I have with me evidence of what I speak.

This, my dear friends, is from CNN by Andrew Carey, July 18, 2024, which would be a little more than 2 months, as I calculate things.

And it reads: "Israeli Lawmakers Vote Overwhelmingly Against Palestinian Statehood"—remember, July 18, 2024. It goes on to say: "Challenging U.S. Policy." This is the style of this article published by CNN.

These are the words. "The Biden administration received another rebuff from Israel Wednesday night—this time from the country's parliament." The parliament would be the Knesset. That would be similar to—not the same as but similar to our Congress.

This is a rebuff, per CNN, from the parliament of Israel "over the United States' longstanding support for the eventual establishment of a Palestinian state."

Now, this is important to me because since I have been in Congress, and I arrived in 2005, there has been a policy of a two-state solution, a state for Palestinians and a state for Israelis—longstanding.

In fact, I have voted for it. I have voted to send money to Israel because I thought the two-state solution was the goal that we were all working toward. I have voted for more than \$50 billion, thinking that we were moving toward a two-state solution.

Well, this article goes on to say: "A two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been U.S. policy for decades"—I agree with that, it has—"but absent negotiations between the two sides, and a lack of sustained effort by the U.S."—I shall repeat—"a lack of sustained effort by the U.S. to make it happen."

Now, the contention in this article is that the United States has not made a sustained effort to make it happen.

I believe that the Biden administration has. I have witnessed much of what the Biden administration is trying to do and has done.

It goes on to read: "On Wednesday evening, the Israeli Parliament made clear its position, voting by 68-9 to reject any creation of a Palestinian state."

Mr. Speaker, 68-9, the Israeli Parliament has voted to reject any creation of a Palestinian state. Many people don't know this. I am grateful that CNN has published it.

It goes on. "The Knesset of Israel firmly opposes the establishment of a Palestinian state west of the Jordan [River]."

Actually, it says west of the Jordan, but we know that that is the Jordan River. The Jordan River is at the West Bank, and it is the West Bank of Jordan, not the West Bank of Israel. It is a part of what should be a Palestinian state. We have the West Bank.

I will read this again because this is exceedingly important. "The Knesset of Israel firmly opposes the establishment of a Palestinian state west of the Jordan [River]."

Now, if you do that west of the Jordan River, that is another way of saying from the river to the sea, from the river to the sea, no Palestinian state from the river to the sea.

Now, in this country, if you say from the river to the sea, Palestine will be free, well, that would be anti-Semitic.

Well, what is it if the Knesset of Israel, the governing body, the Knesset of Israel—and this is not just some person on the street.

“The Knesset of Israel firmly opposes the establishment of a Palestinian state west of the Jordan [River].”

From the river to the sea. That would include all of what at one time was known as Palestine. All of what at one time was known as Palestine.

I challenge anyone within the sound of my voice or anyone who is seeing this to look for a map with Palestine on it, a map depicting the area today.

It is not on the map. You may find it on some, but most maps will not have a place called Palestine on them today.

Now, remember, in 1948, the place that we are now calling Israel, as you will see later on in this article, was called Palestine.

The mandate was to have two states; one for Palestinians, one for Israelis. Somehow, this has metamorphosed into Israel in the minds of many people, but not in my mind.

I am still on the two-state solution program that I voted for and sent more than \$50 billion to help accomplish.

□ 1200

From the river to the sea, the Knesset of Israel firmly opposes a Palestinian state. This is the Knesset of Israel.

It goes on to indicate: “The establishment of a Palestinian state in the heart of the land of Israel”—“a Palestinian state in the heart of the land of Israel.”

Remember, 1948, all of this land was called Palestine—well, I should say 1947, 1948. Then there was a mandate. Pursuant to the mandate, there were to be two states, a State of Israel and a state of Palestine.

However, we find here that the Knesset of Israel has concluded that the establishment of a Palestinian state in the heart of the land of Israel—what happened to Palestine? What happened to the land that was to become a Palestinian state?

“The establishment of a Palestinian state in the heart of the land of Israel would pose an existential danger to the State of Israel and its citizens, perpetuate the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. . . .”

What will happen if there is no state for the Palestinians? Will that be perpetual peace if there is no state for the Palestinians? What are you saying when you say that there will be no state for the Palestinians? What will there be? Will there be a one-state solution in a state called Israel?

If that is the case, what will the Palestinians become? Will they have full

citizenship in a state called Israel? Will they become a part of an apartheid state? What will happen to the Palestinians?

It is a fair question to ask when you have the Israeli Knesset indicating that there will be no Palestinian state from the river to the sea, which is all of what used to be called Palestine.

It goes on to indicate: “perpetuate the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and destabilize the region,” the declaration read.

Well, there are many questions to be asked. I don’t know that the answers are going to be readily available, but it seems to me that this is perspicuously clear, and there will be no Palestinian state if the current Israeli Government has its way.

Let’s go on. Same news article. It reads: “Among those who backed it,” meaning this resolution, “was Benny Gantz, an opponent of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Gantz’ vote serves as a blow to those in Washington”—that would be us—“who see him as someone more inclined to seek a negotiated peace with Palestinians if he ever became Israel’s leader.”

Now we have the current Prime Minister, who is supportive of this resolution, and we have a potential Prime Minister, Mr. Benny Gantz, who has voted in favor of the resolution, as well.

It reads: “Instead, the resolution was ‘a signal to the international community that pressure to impose a Palestinian state on Israel is futile.’” That is what this is supposed to signal, Mr. Speaker, futile.

We are trying to negotiate a two-state solution when the Government of Israel has already passed a resolution that says we are not going to do that, there will be no two-state solution from the river to the sea.

Can you imagine if someone in this country said there will be no Israel from the river to the sea, what our response would be?

Do we not care about the Palestinians? Are they not human beings? Did they not have a place in the land that was called Palestine prior to 1947, 1948? Do the Palestinians not matter to anybody? They ought to have a place in the land that was called Palestine.

“Instead, the resolution was ‘a signal to the international community that pressure to impose a Palestinian state on Israel is futile.’”

Why are we imposing a Palestinian state on Israel? We are imposing a Palestinian state pursuant to the mandate in a place called Palestine. We talk about these things as though Israel owns all of the land, and the Palestinians are foreigners who have somehow encroached upon the land of Israel.

Futile. “Instead, the resolution was ‘a signal to the international community that pressure to impose a Palestinian state on Israel is futile,’ leader of the right-wing opposition ‘New Hope’ Party, Gideon Saar, said, according to the Haaretz newspaper.”

Now we have the Knesset saying no. From the river to the sea, there will be no Palestinian state.

Let’s get another opinion. This article has been published in many publications, including the Times of Israel. This one was taken from the Economic Times, but the essence of what is here has been published many times.

Now, this reads: “‘We are not another star in American flag’: Israel minister dismisses U.S. criticism over emigration of Gazan civilians.” This is from January 3, 2024, not that long ago.

Then this Israeli Prime Minister says: “I really admire the United States of America, but with all due respect”—by the way, I am not angry with him for what I am about to read. I respect him. I am not upset. He says: “I really admire the United States of America, but with all due respect, we are not another star in the American flag.”

I agree with that. You are not another star in the American flag. No quarrel with that. Then he goes on to say—this is Ben Gvir—I want to make sure I get it right. No disrespect to you, sir. He heads the ultranationalist Otzma Yehudit party. This is what he said in the statement, “not another star in the American flag.” I agree, you are not.

Then he adds: “The United States is our best friend”—no disagreement there—“but before everything else, we will do what is good for the State of Israel.” Now, that is a minister, part of the Israeli Government, said he is going to do what is in the best interests of Israel. Who can be upset with him for saying he is going to do what is in the best interests of his country? I think he probably loves his country like I love my country, so he is doing what is in the best interests of his country.

Well, let’s see what he thinks is in the best interests of his country. He goes on to say: “Do what is good for the State of Israel.” Then he adds: “The emigration of hundreds of thousands from Gaza will allow residents”—this is being said parenthetically, but I will read it to you—“[of the border area] to return home and live in security and protect IDF soldiers.”

We need to focus on the word “emigration.” Emigration is thought by some to mean you will leave and you may return, but here is what Webster said emigration is “departure from a place of abode, natural home, or country for life or residence elsewhere.” You are not coming back. He has no problem with emigration of hundreds of thousands from Gaza.

Now, remember, Gaza and the West Bank are about all that the Palestinians can hope for at this point. Gaza and the West Bank, it is about all.

Well, if they leave and they can’t return, then that becomes more land for Israel, which then means that all that the Palestinians may hope for would be the West Bank, which, of course, is being encroached upon by the settlers.

We find ourselves now with this minister indicating that he sees nothing wrong, it would be good for the State of Israel.

Now, dear friends, friends, if this official can say that he will do what is good for the State of Israel, is it wrong for me to stand in the well of the Congress of the United States of America, born here in the United States of America, born in Louisiana, lived my life here in the United States of America, no desire to live anywhere else or move to any other place, is it wrong for me to say that I think I should do what is in the best interests of my country?

He does what is in the best interests of his country; I do what is in the best interests of my country. I don't believe it is in the best interests of my country for us to continue to send billions of dollars to Israel when Israel's Knesset has voted from the river to the sea there will be no Palestinian state. From the river to the sea.

My God, can you imagine what would happen if someone stood here in the well of the House of Representatives and said, from the river to the sea there will be no State of Israel? I don't have to imagine it. I have seen what happens. They get punished. They become an anti-Semite.

What do we call the people who say, from the river to the sea, there will be no Palestinian state? Is there a double standard? Is there a double standard? I believe that there has to be a Palestinian state, so I am out of step with a good many people. Remember, however, I believe it is better to stand alone than to not stand at all.

I don't think that it is good for the United States to continue to fund wars that a good many people in this country do not support. I am one of them. I think it is time to bring this war to an end. It is time for us to move toward a two-state solution, but also more importantly or equally as important, it is time to bring home the hostages. Negotiate so that the hostages can be released. It is time for them to be released. Let them go home.

It is time for us to negotiate a serious two-state solution, but unfortunately the Knesset has said that it will not happen. This government says that it won't.

□ 1215

Well, I contend that if this government says that it won't, that it is okay. The government in Israel has every right to make these comments, but I also think that the government of the United States has every right to say: No more money, no more bombs, no more planes. You can do what you choose, you are a sovereign nation, but so is the United States of America.

We are a sovereign Nation, Mr. Speaker. We have every right to say: That if you can't agree on the two-state solution that was mandated in 1948, 1947, then okay.

We don't have to support eternal conflict. We don't have to support the war

where thousands of babies have been killed. We don't have to support the taking of the land from the Palestinians in the West Bank by the settlers. We don't have to support this.

But I don't speak for us. I speak for myself and everybody who agrees with me, and a good many people do, by the way.

I believe that our alternative to continuing to support the erosion of Palestinian land, the taking of Palestinian land, the declaring that there will be no Palestinian state, I think we should acknowledge that you are a sovereign nation, but so are we and that we will stand for what we have stood for for decades and that is a two-state solution.

I compliment President Biden for making this a significant issue as we go through this time of great turmoil. I compliment him, but I think that we have reached a point now where there has to be a change in our policy. If Israel changed its policy, we can change ours. It is time for a change in the American policy.

We can still be friends. The government of Israel, the country of Israel, will be our friend, but we don't have to support this war. We can ask for peace, and peace is the solution. There is not going to be a solution other than a peaceful two-state solution if you want peace.

Now, if you want eternal conflict or if you want calm, if you want things to calm down, then you can have a one-state solution. Remember this: There is a calm in a dungeon where people are suffering. You can have calm in a dungeon, but that is not peace.

If we want peace where neighbors can work together, you have to work toward it. You don't make peace with friends. They are already in a peaceful relationship. You have to make peace with people who have been antithetical to your views.

It is time to say you don't have to make peace, but we don't have to support what you are doing.

We have got an aircraft carrier with Americans out there at risk, nuclear powered. It is like a floating military base. When we send out these nuclear-powered aircraft carriers, I am told they can be fueled such that, if need be, they can stay for 25 years, and it has other ships and other aircraft there with it, some 90 aircraft.

Our people are at risk because we have a state, by and through its government, who is saying there will be no two-state solution, and we have now what appears to be a conflict that is expanding and may eventually become a conflagration. It is expanding.

I am for everybody having the right to defend themselves, and that has to include the State of Israel.

I am also for peace, and peace is not going to be gained by continuing the process of making war. At some point, either someone is going to trigger something that will take this to a different place, or we will back off and try

to have arrangements first and then peace to follow. All of the hostages should be brought home, all of them.

Now, I close with this, Mr. Speaker. I have said that I don't think that our government should continue to support the war, but I don't speak for the government, so I am going to speak for myself now. I didn't speak for the government before. Everything that I have said, I speak for myself and all of those who agree with me.

Here is what I say. If you bring a standalone bill to this floor, I am going to vote against it. If it is a standalone bill, just as the last one was—I believe it was the last—to send more funds to Israel, it is no secret, don't count me as a yea. Count me as a nay if you bring a standalone bill.

Now, someone would say: Why wouldn't you just say that you are going to vote against any bill?

Well, because I have been here long enough to have the good sense to know that these things can be packaged such that you have to hold your nose and your breath and close your eyes and turn your back and just vote for it. You may not want to, but the way it is packaged can push you into a corner, a place that you dare not go and don't want to be, but you do.

If you bring a standalone bill, I am voting against it and probably will vote against others that are not standalone, depending on how they have been packaged. It is time for us to take a stand.

There is a song, a spiritual song, that has the words "just stand," "just stand." "After you've done all you can"—and I am doing all that I can.

After you have done all that you can, knowing that it is dangerous to be right in affairs where established men are wrong, after you have done all that you can, just stand. Just stand. Stand for liberty and justice for all as represented by that flag behind the Speaker.

Stand with Carlyle: "No lie can live forever."

Stand with William Cullen Bryant: "Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again."

Stand with Dr. King: "The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice."

Stand knowing that the words of C.A. Tindley are powerful and right:

Harder yet may be the fight;  
Right may often yield to might;  
Wickedness high may seem to reign;  
And Satan's cause may seem to gain.  
But there is a God that rules above,  
With a hand of power and a heart of love;  
And when I am right, I just believe that  
God will help me fight.

Harder yet may be the fight, Mr. Speaker.

Harder may be the fight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL REFERENDUM PROCESS IN FLORIDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FONG). Under the Speaker's announced