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groups from other nations. This un- Artisan organization is doing something more than just talking about interna- tional understanding—it is doing something about it.

If mankind is ever to abolish war from the face of the earth, we must first break down the barriers of mistrust and suspicion that surround the operation of the world. There is no better way to accom- plish this than through such pro- grams as this one conducted by the American Council of Young Political Leaders.

These young people will be the lead- ers of the world in years to come. They will be better leaders, more understand- ing and tolerant leaders, if they are able to expand their knowledge of one another's nations, other peoples, and other political systems.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to have the support of the American Council of Young Political Leaders. They have my wholehearted support in their program to further world understanding.

THE 14TH AMENDMENT—EQUAL PROTECTION LAW OR TOOL OF USUATION

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Raskin) may ex- tend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. Raskin. Mr. Speaker, arrogantly ignoring clearcut expressions in the Constitu- tion of the United States, the de- ceited intent of its drafters notwithstanding, our unelected Federal judges read out prohibitions of the Constitution of the United States into the Bill, thereby confusing the drafted by the states to legislate their personal ideas, prejudices, theories, guilt complexes, aims, and whims.

Through the cooperation of intellec- tual educators, we have subjected our- selves to accept destructive use and meaning of words and phrases. We blindly accept new meanings and changed values to alter our traditional thoughts.

We have tolerated the permitted the habitual misuse of words to serve as a vehicle to abandon our founding do- gma. Thus, the present use and expan- sion of the 14th amendment is a sham—serving as a crutch and hoodwink to precipitate a quasi-legal approach for over- throw of the tender balance and protec- tions of limitation found in the Constitu- tion.

But, interestingly enough, the 14th amendment—whether ratified or not—was the instrument that had been used to pour out partial sentiment following the War Between the States. Its obvious purpose and intent was but to free human beings from ownership as a chattel and nothing but. Its aim was no more than to free the slaves.

As our politically appointed Federal judiciary proceeds down their chosen path of chaotic departure from the peo- ple’s government by substituting their personal law rationalized under the 14th amendment, the judiciary has very firmly branded themselves as seces- sionists—rebels with pens instead of guns—seeking to divide our Union.

They must be stopped. Public opinion must be brought to bear on Congress. The Union must and shall be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include in the Record, following my remarks, House Concurrent Resolution 208 of the Louisi- ana Legislature. The resolution the House of Representatives urge the Congress to declare the 14th amendment illegal. Also, I include in the Record an informative and well-annotated treatise on the illegality of the 14th amendment—a play toy of our secessionist judges—which has been prepared by Judge Leander H. Perez, of Louisiana.

The material referred to follows:

H. Con. Res. 208

A concurrent resolution to expose the un- constitutionality of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to interpose the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana and the Constitutions of said amendment in this State; to memorialize the Congress of the United States to ren- der its judgment upon the constitutionality of said amendment on or before the 31st day of July 1968, declaring that said amendment has been ratified; and to provide for the distribu- tion of copies of this resolution.

Whereas the purported 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the requirements of the United States Constitution because eleven states of the Union were deprived of their equal suffrage in the Senate, whereas the population of the so-called "Southern States" is approximately 25% that of the Northern States, whereas the population of the United States is 75 million, whereas the United States is the 7th largest nation in the world, whereas the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution was never lawfully adopted because it was ratified by the Federal courts to impose a unconstitutional act of Congress, whereas the Union was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the United States Constitution, whereas the Constitution of the United States was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the United States Constitution, whereas the Constitution of the United States was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the United States Constitution, whereas the Constitution of the United States was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the United States Constitution, whereas the Constitution of the United States was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the United States Constitution, whereas the Constitution of the United States was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the United States Constitution, whereas the Constitution of the United States was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the United States Constitution, whereas the Constitution of the United States was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the United States Constitution, whereas the Constitution of the United States was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the United States Constitution.

The 14th Amendment is unconstitutional.

The purported 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution is and should be held to be ineffectual, invalid, null, void and unconstitutional for the following reasons:

1. The Joint Resolution proposing said Amendment was not submitted to or adopted by a Constitutional Congress. Article I, Section 3, and Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

2. The Joint Resolution was not submitted to the President for his approval. Article I, Section 7.

3. The proposed 14th Amendment was re- jected by more than one-fourth of all the States then in the Union, and it was never ratified by three-fourths of all the States in the Union. Article V.

1. THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONGRESS

The U.S. Constitution provides:

Article I, Section 3: "The Congress of the United States shall be composed of two Senator- from each State . . . ."

Article V provides: "No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suf- frage in the Senate . . . ."

The fact that 23 Senators have been unlaw- fully excluded from the U.S. Senate, in order to justify the constitutional validity of the Joint Resolution proposing the 14th Amendment is shown by Resolutions of-
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cannot be a constitutional Congress, when the representation of each State forms an integral part of the constitution. It is not part of the power of the President, nor was it intended by the Constitution to propose amendments. We have not authorized to establish that Georgia had a right in the first place, as a part of the Constitution, to act under its amendment. Shall these amendments be proposed? Every other excluded State had the same right.

"The first of the privileges has been arbitrarily denied. Had these amendments been submitted to a constitutional Congress, they never would have been proposed to the States. . . . the States would never have proposed to eleven States voluntarily to reduce their political power in the Union, and at the same time disfranchise the larger portion of the integrated and patriotic voice of eleven co-equal States."

"The Florida Legislature, by Resolution of December 5, 1966, protested as follows: "Let this alteration be made in the organic system and some of the constitutional amendments may or may not be required by the predominant party previous to allowing the States to act. The Florida Legislature, now unlawfully and unconstitutionally deprived of the privileges of representation to enter the halls of the National Legislative. Their right to representation is protected by the Constitution of this country and there is no act, not even that of rebellion, can deprive them of its exercise."

"The South Carolina Legislature by Resolution of November 27, 1966, protested as follows: "Eleven of the Southern States, including South Carolina, objected to the inclusion of the amendment in Congress. Although their Senators and Representatives have been duly elected and have presented themselves for the purpose of their credentials have, in most instances, been laid upon the table without being read, or have been referred to a committee, who have failed to make any report on the subject. In short, Congress has refused to exercise its Constitutional functions, and decide either upon the election, the return, or the qualification of these selected by the States and their Representatives. Some of the Senators and Representatives of the Southern States were prepared to take the test oath, but these have been persistently ignored, and the seats to which they were entitled under the Constitution and laws."

"I believe this amendment has not been proposed by 'two-thirds of both Houses' of a legally constituted Congress, and is not, Constitutionally or legitimately, before a single Legislature for ratification.""

"The North Carolina Legislature by Resolution of December 6, 1966, as follows: "Congress shall consist of a House of Representatives, composed of members appointed among the respective States in the proportion of their population, and of at least two members from each State. And in the Article which concerns the Amendment, it is expressly provided that 'no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.' The contemplated Amendment was not proposed to the States in a constitutional Convention. At the time of its adoption, the eleven seceding States were deprived of representation both in the Senate and House of Representatives, and the Senate and Representatives of the States were outvoted."

3 South Carolina House Journal, 1966, pp. 33 and 34.

"Also, the Constitution required that at the time of its adoption, the eleven seceding States were deprived of representation both in the Senate and House of Representatives, and the Senate and Representatives of the States were outvoted."

1 New Jersey Acts, March 27, 1868.
2 Alabama House Journal 1866, pp. 210-213.
3 Texas House Journal 1866, p. 877.
4 Arkansas House Journal, 1866, p. 287.
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1 New Jersey Acts, March 27, 1868.
2 Alabama House Journal 1866, pp. 210-213.
3 Texas House Journal 1866, p. 877.
4 Arkansas House Journal, 1866, p. 287.

...
On August 20, 1866, President Andrew Johnson issued another proclamation pointing out the fact that the House of Represen- tatives had adopted resolutions on July 22nd and July 25th, 1865, that the Civil War forced by dissensions of the Southern States, was not waged for the purpose of overthrowing the rights and established institu- tions of those States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and to preserve the Union with all equality and rights of the several states unimpaired, and that as soon as these objectives are accom- plished, the war might cease. The Presi- dent's proclamation on June 13, 1866, de- clared the insurrection in the State of Ten- nessee had been suppressed. The Presi- dent's proclamation on April 2, 1866, de- clared the insurrection in the other Southern States, except Texas, no longer existed. It was argued that Senate and House of Representatives are claimed that the insurrection in the State of Texas had been completely ended; and his signature, or more than a third of the number of states of the Union as of that date, shall less than three-fourths of the states possess to ratify the same, the President is required to assent in form and in law, and it could not have been revived except by a new Joint Resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives in accordance with Constitutional requirement.

3. Faced with the positive failure of rati- fication of the 14th Amendment, both Houses of Congress passed over the veto of the Presi- dent three Acts known as Reconstruction Acts, between the dates of March 2 and April 19, 1867. These Acts, 15 Stat. p. 14, et seq., designed illegally to remove with "military force" the lawfully constituted governments of the Southern States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. In consideration of President Johnson's Veto message on the Reconstruction Act of March 2, 1867, he pointed out these unconstitutinalities:

"In all these States there are existing consti- tutions, framed in the accustomed way by the people. Congress, however, declares that these are illegal, and calls upon the people to form themselves. And that, then, in the opinion of Con- gress, is necessary to make the constitution of a State legal or not, is for them to say. The existing constitutions of the ten States conform to the ac- knowledged standards of loyalty and republic- anism. Indeed, if there are degrees in re- publican forms of government, their constitu- tions are more republican now, than when these States—four of which were members of the original thirteen—first became members of the Union."

In President Andrew Johnson's Veto mes- sage on the Reconstruction Act on July 1867, he pointed out various unconstitutionalities as follows:

"It is now too late to say that these ten political communities are not States within this Union. Declarations to the contrary made in these three acts are contradicted again and again by repeated acts of the Congresses convened by Congress from the year 1861 to 1867.

"During that period, while these States were in actual rebellion, and after that rebellion was brought to a close, they have been again and again recognized as States of the Union, and have been admitted as such into the Union by a new State and carry on an illegal State government by the same federal agency."

"It is now too late to say that these ten political communities are not States within this Union. Declarations to the contrary made in these three acts are contradicted again and again by repeated acts of the Congresses convened by Congress from the year 1861 to 1867.

"During that period, while these States were in actual rebellion, and after that rebellion was brought to a close, they have been again and again recognized as States of the Union, and have been admitted as such into the Union by a new State and carry on an illegal State government by the same federal agency."

"They have been called upon by Congress to return to the Union, and they have returned to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the Union, and they have been granted the right to return to the United States at least two amendments to the Constitution of the United States. As States. They have ratified. They ratified one amendment, which required the apportionment of twenty-seven States of the thirty-six then composing the Union. When the requisite twenty-five votes were given in favor of that amendment—seven of which votes were given by seven of the ten States—it was proclaimed to be a part of the Constitution of the United States, and the Constitution of the United States, as of those States, was finally made by Congress in Congress in the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction. If these seven States were not legal States of the Union, it followed that Congress, in its status as a legislature in some of the States slavery yet exists. It does not exist
in these seven States, for they have abolisued it also in their State constitutions; but Ken-
tucky not having done so, it would still re-
maint in that State. But, in truth, if this abolition movement has failed in the legal State governments be true, then the aboli-
tion of slavery by these illegal governments be an evil. For, Congress now denies to these States the power of severing themselves by deening to them the power to elect a legal State legislature, or to frame a constitution for themselves, for such a purpose as the abolition of slavery.

"As to the other constitutional amend-
ment, on the other hand, the phrase, it hap-
pens that these States have, in fact, carried out the consequence. The idea is never has been proclaimed or understood, even by the ap-
pointment of judges, district attorneys, and marshals for every one of these States, i.e., if they are not legal States, not one of these judges is authorized to hold a court. So, too, both houses of the legislature have passed pro-
pagation bills to pay all these judges, at-
torneys, and officers of the United States for extinguishing the debts that are due them. Again, in the machinery of the internal rev-
ence laws, all these States are districted, not "Thirteen," but as States."

"So much for the correctness of the refer-
ence. The instances cited, however, fall far short of all that might be enumerated. Examples of the same kind have been frequent and unwavering. The same may be said as to judicial recognition through the Supreme Court of the United States.

..."To me these considerations are conclusive of the unconstitutionality of this part of the bill now before me; and I am convinced that their consideration to the deliberate judg-
ment of Congress. [And now to the Court.] "Within a period less than a year, the Legis-
lation of Congress has attempted to strip the executive department of the government of some of its essential powers. The Constitu-
tion, and the oath provided in it, devolve upon the President the power and duty to see that no laws be a law excepted. The Constitution, in order to carry out this power, gives him the choice of the agents, and it is to this power subject to his control and supervision. But if the assumption of the State laws the constitutional obligation upon the President remains, but the powers to exer-
cise it. It is a constitutional power which is really taken away. The military commander is, as to the power of appointment, made to take the oath of the General the place of the Senate; and any at-
tempt on the part of the President to assert his own constitutional power may, under present law, be met by official incoordi-
nation. It is to be feared that these military officers, looking to the authority given by the Constitution, will not be disposed to exercise it. The Constitution, will recognize no authority but the commander of the district and the Gen-
eral of the army.

"If there be no other objection than this to this proposed legislation, it would be sufficient.

"They can contend that the Reconstruc-
tion Acts were ever upheld as being valid and constitutional. They were brought into question, but the Court decided in favor of them. Without being appealed from by Congress from finally adjudicating upon their constitutionality.

"As to the case of President Andrew John-
son, (4 Wall. 675-502) was a case brought before the President of the United States from enforcing provisions of the Reconstruc-
tion Acts, they were held right and that the President cannot be enjoined by the Judicial Department of the government to attempt to enforce the performance of the duties by the President might be justly charged with a violation of the Constitution. As a violation of the Constitution, as a violation of that Constitution, Marshall, as "Aead and exceptably the extravagance." The Court further said that if the Court granted the injunction against the President, it would be against the Constitution. If the President refused obedience, it is need-
less to observe that the Court is without power to enforce."

In a joint action, the states of Georgia and Mississippi brought suit against the the President and the Secretary of War. (6 Wall. 50-78, 154 U.S. 83.)

The Court said that:

"The bill then sets forth that the intent and design of the Congress is, as apparent on their face and by their terms, to overthrow and annull this existing state government, and to erect another and dif-
ergovernments in its place, unauthorized by the Constitution and in defiance of its guarantees; and that, in furtherance of this intent and design, the defendants, the Secretary of War, the General of the Army, and Major-General Pope, acting under orders of the President, are about in motion a portion of the armed forces of the United States. It is holding inadeguate means to resist the power of the Executive Department of the United States; and she therefore insists that such protection of the Constitution and the laws as she is able to be afforded by a decree or order of his court in the premises.

"Applications for injunction by the two states to prohibit the Executive Depart-
ment from carrying out the provisions of the Reconstruction Acts directed to the over-
thrust of the existing state government, including the dissolution of their state legislatures, were denied on the grounds that the organization of the state government and depart-
ments, the executive, legislative, and judicial, carried limitations of the powers of each by the Constitution. This case when the same way as the previous case of Mississipi against President Johnson and was dismissed without adjudicating upon the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts.

In another case, ex parte William H. Mc-
Cardle (7 Wall. 506-515), a petition for the writ of habeas corpus was disallowing restraint by military force of a citizen not of the military service of the United States was before the United States Supreme Court, in the case of Mr. Chief Justice, which was held right and the President repassed over his veto, re-
pealing the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court in such case. Accordingly, the Supreme Court dismissed the appeal without passing upon the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts, under which the non-military citizen was held by the military without the benefit of writ of habeas corpus, in viola-
tion of Section 9, Article I of the U.S. Con-
stitution which gives him the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus.

That Act of Congress placed the Recon-
struction Acts beyond judicial recourse and therefore beyond the aid of the Constitution. It is recorded that one of the Supreme Court Justices, McPherson, protested against the action of the Court as follows:

The Court in the case of the president, at the beginning of this month. It is a case which in-
volves the liberty and rights, not only of the appellant but of millions of our fellow citizens. The individual who has the right to expect that it would receive the immediate and solemn attention of the court. By her postponement of this case we shall subject ourselves to neither justice or un-
justly, to the imputation that we have evaded the performance of a duty imposed on us by the Constitution, and waited for legislative interposition to supersede our action as its substitute. I am not willing to be a partaker of the cul-
eury or oppression that may follow. I can only say...I am ashamed that such a case should be cast upon the court and that it cannot be refuted.

The ten States were organized into Military Reconstructions under the unjustly Recon-
struction Acts," their lawfully constituted State legislature were removed by "mili-
tary force," and they were replaced by rump, expelled legislatures, which carried out military orders and pretended to ratify the 14th Amendment, as follows:

North Carolina on July 3, 1868; South Carolina on July 9, 1868; Louisiana on July 9, 1868; South Carolina on July 9, 1868; Alabama on July 13, 1868; and Georgia on July 21, 1868.

The above 7 States whose legislatures were removed and replaced by rump, so-
called Legislatures, six (6) Legislatures of the States of Louisiana, Arkansas, South Caro-

a McPherson, Reconstruction, p. 53.

b House Journal 1868, p. 15, Senate Journal 1868, p. 15.


d Senate Journal 1868, p. 21.

f Senate Journal, 49th Congress, 2nd Seisan, p. 725.

g House Journal, 1868, p. 60.


k Same, Vol. VI, pp. 119-133.

l Same, Vol. VI, pp. 3629-3628.

m 14 Stat. p. 428, etc. 15 Stat. p. 14, etc.
Arkansas, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina, Alabama and Georgia.

In that case, the Court brushed aside constitutional questions as though they did not exist and declared, in substance, the Court made the statement that:

"The legislatures of Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina had rejected the 14th Amendment when it was submitted to the people in June, 1866. New governments were erected in those States (and in others) under the direction of Congress and under the construction of the amendment, that of North Carolina on July 4, 1868, that of South Carolina on July 8, 1868, and that of Georgia on July 21, 1868."

And the Court gave no consideration to the fact that Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina were three of the original states of the Union, or to the construction of the Constitution on an equal footing with the other original states and those later admitted into the Union.

What constitutional right did Congress have to remove those state governments and their legislatures under unlawful military control; to establish Congress-controlled governments in those states and to nullify their Constitutions?

The fact that these three states and seven other Southern States had existing Constitutions, and that these Constitutions were not nullified, but were permitted, if not actually upheld, by Congress and the National judicial tribunals, was not even adverted to by the Court. The Court, therefore, contrived a basis of nullification of Constitutional Amendments.

The Secretary of State bowed to the action of Congress and issued his Proclamation of July 18, 1868, in which he stated that he was acting under authority of the Act of April 20, 1818, but pursuant to said Resolution of 1868. He listed three-fourths or so of the then 37 states as having ratified the 14th Amendment, including the purported ratification of the unwarranted puppet legislatures of the States of Arkansas, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina and Alabama. Without saying it unlawfully purported ratifications there would have been only 25 states left to ratify out of 37 when a minimum of 28 states was required for ratification by three-fourths of the States of the Union.

The President of the United States, reporting the result of the supposed ratification of the Secretary of State also included purported ratifications by the states of Arkansas, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina and Alabama in his Proclamation. The Proclamation recognized the fact that the legislatures of said states, several months previously, had withdrawn their ratifications and effectively had nullified the 14th Amendment in January, 1868, and April, 1868.

Therefore, deducing these two states from the purported ratifications of the 14th Amendment, only 23 State ratifications at most could be claimed; whereas the ratification of 28 States, or three-fourths of 37 States in the Union, were required to ratify the 14th Amendment.

From all of the above documented historic facts, it is inescapable that the 14th Amendment was never adopted as a part of the Constitution, that it has no legal effect, and it should be declared by the Congress and the National judicial tribunals, and therefore null, void and of no effect.

THE CONSTITUTION STIRS THE 14TH AMENDMENT WITH NULLITY

The defenders of the 14th Amendment construction and action took up the case and finally declared its validity. Such is not the case.

In what is considered the leading case, Congress against Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113, 24 L. Ed. 774, in which the U.S. Supreme Court did not uphold the validity of the 14th Amendment.


16 House Journal, 40th Congress, 2d Session, p. 1126 etc.


method required by Article V. Anything beyond that which a court is called upon to hold in Article V, and a judgment would be equivalent to writing into Article V another mode of the amendment which has never been authorized by the people of the United States.

On this point, therefore, the question is, was the 14th Amendment proposed and ratified in Article V?

In answering this question, it is of no real moment that decisions have been rendered in which the parties did not contest or submit propositions that there was a 14th Amendment. If a statute never in fact passed by Congress, through some error in printing and printing got into the published reports of Constitution and statutes, and if under such supposed statute courts had levied punishment upon a number of persons charged under it, and if the error in the published volume was discovered and the fact became known that no such statute had ever passed in Congress, it is unthinkable that the Courts would continue to administer punishment in similar cases, on a non-existent statute because prior decisions had done so. If that be so in the way we need only realize the greater truth when the principle is applied to the solemn question of the constitutionality of the Constitution.

While the defects in the method of proposing and the subsequent method of computing ratification is briefed elsewhere, it should be the primary fault for the framers of the Constitution and provisions of Article V. The very Congress which proposed the 14th Amendment under the first part of Article V was itself, at that very time, violating the last part as well as the first part of Article V of the Constitution. We shall see how that was.

There is one, and only one, provision of the Constitution of the United States which is forever immutable—which can never be changed. The Constitution cannot alter it; the executives cannot change it; the Congress cannot change it; the States themselves—even all the States in perfect concert—cannot amend it in any manner whatsoever, whether they act through conventions called for the purpose or through their legislatures. Not even the unanimous vote of every voter in the United States could amend this provision. It is a perpetual fixture in the Constitution itself. The framers of the Constitution contemplated the instrument as a rule for the government of courts, as well as of the legislature.

"Why does a judge swear to discharge his duties agreeably to the constitution of the United States, if that constitution forms no rule for his government?"

"If such be the real state of things, that is worse than solemn mockery. To prescribe, or make this oath, becomes equally a crime."

"Thus, the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States laid down but fixed principles, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions..."

The framers of the constitution contemplated the instrument as a rule for the government of courts, as well as of the legislature.

"The federal courts actually refuse to hear argument on the invalidity of the 14th Amendment even when the issue is presented squarely by the pleadings and the evidence as above.

Only an aroused public sentiment in favor of preserving the Constitution and our institutions and freedoms under constitutional government, and the future security of our country, will break the political barrier which now prevents judicial consideration of the unconstitutionality of the 14th amendment.

THE MIDEAST CRISIS—NOT BACKWARD TO BELLIGERENCY BUT FORWARD TO PEACE

Mr. FYOR. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be enabled to print an amendment which may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the reception of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker. The distinguished Foreign Minister of the State of Israel, Abba Eban, in his address to the United Nations Security Council on June 6, 1967, set the theme for a lasting peace in the Middle East so much desired by all the peace-loving nations of the world. His address was entitled, "The Belligerent to Belligerency but Forward to Peace."

On June 7, 1967, following the first United Nations resolution calling for a cease-fire in the Middle East, I stated to a distinguished group of Americans who visited me in Washington as follows:

I deem it most imperative that the terms of the agreement to follow the cease-fire provide effective guarantees, to the end that permanent peace may be established in the Middle East.

The interests of world peace would best be served if the terms provide:

1. For recognition of the validity of the sovereignty of the State of Israel by the G.A.R. and other Arab states.

2. A reaffirmation that the Gulf of Aqaba is an international waterway and will remain open for free passage to shipping of all nations through the Straits of Tiran.

3. An end to the Suez Canal to shipping of all nations.

4. An ending of terrorism and border raids so that neither nation may carry out its desire to live in peace with its neighbors.

5. For direct negotiations between Israel and her Arab neighbors for the resolution of other pending issues.

Indeed, it is within the province of the sovereign State of Israel to speak its mind on the terms of its agreement with the United Nations to follow the cease-fire—the terms which in its view will best insure permanent peace in the Middle East. We on the other hand take the opportunity to make suggestions which in our opinion will best secure the peace of the world—thereby also serving the best interests of the United States.

An elaboration of the five points suggested June 6, 1966, is accordingly in order.

1. THE STATE OF ISRAEL—A SOVEREIGN NATION

The State of Israel is a member of the United Nations—a full-fledged member of the family of nations. Though the integrity of her borders were guaranteed by the major powers during 30 years—the State of Israel was obliged to go to war to put a stop to the violation of her boundary lines.

It is therefore basic to any plan for permanent peace in the Middle East that the sovereignty of the State of Israel be recognized by her neighbors. This fact cannot be questioned—this truth is and should not be negotiable because her import was underlined by the events of the day.

The foundation for a permanent peace in the Middle East must be the absolute and unqualified recognition by the Arab States of the right of the State of Israel to exist as a sovereign state among other sovereign states. This foundation being laid, then Israel and her Arab neighbors can, through direct negotiations, begin to build the structure leading to permanent peace.

2. STRAIT OF TIRAN—AN INTERNATIONAL WATERWAY

Since 1950, Egypt has repeatedly given assurances that the Strait of Tiran would remain open for "innocent passage