groups from other nations. This bipartisan organization is doing something more than just talking about international understanding—it is doing something about it. The world is ever to abolish war from the face of the earth, we first must break down the barriers of mistrust and suspicion among the peoples of the world. There is no better way to accomplish this than through just such programs as this one conducted by the American Council of Young Political Leaders.

The young people will be the leaders of the world in years to come. They will be better leaders, more understanding and tolerant leaders, if they are able to expand their knowledge of other nations, other peoples, and other political systems.

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

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

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Rarick] may extend 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. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, arrogantly ignoring clearcut expressions in the Constitution of the United States, the declared intent of its drafters notwithstanding, our unelected Federal judges read out prohibitions of the Constitution of the United States by adopting the fuzzy haze of the 14th amendment to legitimize their personal ideas, prejudices, theories, guilt complexes, aims, and whims.

Through the cooperation of intellectual educators, we have subjected ourself to a destructive and unprofitable method of making laws. We blindly accept new meanings and changed values to alter our traditional thoughts.

We have tolerated the habitual misuse of words to serve as a vehicle to abandon our foundations and goals. Thus, the present use and expansion of the 14th amendment is a sham—serving as a cloak and hoodwink to precipitate a quasi-legal approach for overthrow of the tender balances and protections of limitation found in the Constitution.

But, interestingly enough, the 14th amendment—whether ratified or not—was but the expression of emotional outpouring of public sentiment following the War Between the States. Its obvious purpose and intent was but to free human beings from ownership as a chattel by other humans. Its aim was not to free the slaves.

As our politically appointed Federal Judiciary proceeds down their chosen path of chaotic departure from the people's government by substituting their personal law rationalized under the 14th amendment, their actions and verbiage brand them and their team as secession—seeking instead of guns—seeking to divide our Union.

They must be stopped. Public opinion must be aroused. 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 Louisiana Senate urging this 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—the play toy of our secessionist judges—writ large presented to the President by Judge Leander H. Perez, of Louisiana.

The material referred to follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

A concurrent resolution to expose the unconstitutionality of the 14th amendment to the United States Constitution to interpose the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana against the execution of said amendment to memorialize the Congress of the United States to repeal its Joint resolution of July 28, 1868, declaring that three-fourths of the states had ratified said 14th amendment and also included extraneous matter.

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 seven states of the Union were not among the thirty-seven states of the Union that ratified the 14th Amendment with nullity; and to provide for the distribution of certified 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 seven states of the Union were not among the thirty-seven states of the Union that ratified the 14th Amendment with nullity; and to provide for the distribution of certified copies of this resolution.

The material referred to follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

A concurrent resolution to expose the unconstitutionality of the 14th amendment to the United States Constitution to interpose the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana against the execution of said amendment to memorialize the Congress of the United States to repeal its Joint resolution of July 28, 1868, declaring that three-fourths of the states had ratified the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The material referred to follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

A concurrent resolution to expose the unconstitutionality of the 14th amendment to the United States Constitution to interpose the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana against the execution of said amendment to memorialize the Congress of the United States to repeal its Joint resolution of July 28, 1868, declaring that three-fourths of the states had ratified the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.

The material referred to follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

A concurrent resolution to expose the unconstitutionality of the 14th amendment to the United States Constitution to interpose the sovereignty of the State of Louisiana against the execution of said amendment to memorialize the Congress of the United States to repeal its Joint resolution of July 28, 1868, declaring that three-fourths of the states had ratified the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution.
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Test adopted by the following State Legislatures:

The New Jersey Legislature by Resolution of March 27, 1868.

Arkansas Journal 1866, p. 297.

Texas House Journal, 1866, p. 577.

Arkansas House Journal, 1866, p. 297.

The said proposed amendment not having yet received the assent of the three-fourths of the States necessary to render it valid, the natural and constitutional right of this State to withdraw its assent is undeniable.

The said proposition, for the purpose of securing the assent of the requisite majority, determined to, and did, exclude from the said two houses eighty representatives from eleven States of the Union, upon the pretense that there were no such States in the Union; but, finding that the integrity of the United States could not be brought to assent to the said proposition, they deliberately formed a system and some new and more startling devices to deprive the said States of their right of representation in Congress, and thus practically destroyed the Union; and, inasmuch as all legislative power granted by the Constitution, isexpresly 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 by a Congress thus constituted. At the time of its adoption, the Senate and House were deprived of representation both in the Senate and House, although they all, except the State of Texas, had Senators and Representatives duly elected and claiming their privileges under the Constitution. In consequence of this, these States had no voice on the important question of proposing the Amendment. Had this Amendment been proposed without their votes, the proposition would doubtless have failed to command the required two-thirds majority.

If the votes of these States are necessary to a valid ratification of the Amendment, they were equally necessary on the question of rejecting it to the States; for it would be difficult, in the opinion of the Committee, to show by what process of logic, men of intelligence could arrive at a different conclusion.

Article I, Section 7 provides that not only every bill which shall have been passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States Congress, but that:

"Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill."

The Joint Resolution proposing the 14th Amendment was never presented to the President of the United States; and, for thirty-seven months, as President Andrew Johnson stated in his message on June 22, 1868, therefore, the Joint Resolution and its riders are inoperative.

III. Proposed Amendment Never Ratified by Three-fourths of the States

1. Premitting the ineffectiveness of said resolution, as above, fifteen (15) States out of the then thirty-seven (37) States of the Union rejected the proposed 14th Amendment between the date of its submission to the States by the Secretary of State on June 16, 1866 and March 24, 1868, thereby further nullifying said resolution and making it impossible for its ratification by the constitutionally required three-fourths of such States, as shown by the rejections thereby of the Legislatures of the following States:

Texas rejected the 14th Amendment on October 27, 1866. Florida rejected the 14th Amendment on November 9, 1866.

North Carolina rejected the 14th Amendment on December 6, 1866.

Arkansas rejected the 14th Amendment on December 7, 1866.

North Carolina rejected the 14th Amendment on December 14, 1866.

South Carolina rejected the 14th Amendment on December 19, 1866.

Kentucky rejected the 14th Amendment on January 8, 1867.

4 New Jersey Senate Journal, 1866-67, pp. 66 and 93.

14 Stat. 358. etc.

15 Senate Journal, 39th Congress, 1st sess., p. 262.

16 House Journal, 1866, pp. 578-584—Senate Journal 1866, p. 471.

17 House Journal, 1866, p. 68— Senate Journal 1866, p. 72.

18 House Journal, 1866, p. 75—Senate Journal 1866, p. 8.


On August 20, 1866, President Andrew Johnson issued another proclamation 23 pointing out the fact that the House of Representa-
tives had adopted identical Interim Resolutions on July 22d 24 and July 29th, 1861, that the Civil War forced by disclosures of the Southern States, was never
waged for the purpose of conquest or to overthrow the rights and established insti-
tutions through force and blood, but to 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 objects are
reached, the war ought to cease. The Presi-
dent's proclamation on June 13, 1866, de-
clared the insurrection in the other Southern
States, except Texas, no longer existed.
On August 20, 1866, 25 the President pro-
claimed that the insurrection in the State of
Texas had been completely ended; and his proclamation continued: "the insurrection which heretofore existed in the State of
Texas, and as such is to be regarded in that State, as in the other States before named in which the said Insurrection are more republican now, than when the
Southern States were in actual rebellion, and after that rebellion was brought to a close, they have not legal governments, and then
the Constitution leaves exclusively to the States themselves. All this legislative machinery of martial law, military coercion, and political
reconstruction is wholly unavailing. His proclamation concluded: "In case the Federal Constitution leaves exclusively to the States
themselves. All this legislative machinery of martial law, military coercion, and political
reconstruction is wholly unavailing. His proclamation concluded: "In case the Federal

President Andrew Johnson, in his Veto message of March 2, 1867, 26 pointed out that: "The provisions of the 14th Amend-
ent have each of them an actual govern-
ment with all the powers, executive, judicial and legisla-
tive, which properly belong to a free State. They are organized like the other States of the Union, and, like them, they have, administer, and execute the laws which govern their domestic affairs.
If further proof were needed that these States were operating under legally constitu-
ted governments as member States in the
United States, the provisions of the 14th Amend-
ment by December 8, 1865 undoubtedly sup-
pplies this official proof. If the Southern States of the former States of the Union, the 13th Amendment would not have been submitted to their Legislatures for ratific-
ation.
2. The 13th Amendment to the United States Constitution was proposed by Joint resolution of Congress 27 and was approved
February 1, 1865 by President Abraham Lin-
coln, as required by Article I, Section 7 of the United States Constitution. The President's sign of approval makes it a part of the Constitution.
The 13th Amendment was ratified by 27 states of the then 36 states of the Union, including the Southern States of Virginia, Louisi-
a, Arkansas, South Carolina, Alabama, North Carolina and Georgia. This is shown by the Proclamation of the Secretary of State December 18, 1865. Without the votes of these 7 Southern States Legislatures the 18th Amendment would have failed. This was largely due to the fact that the ratification by these 7 Southern States of the 13th Amendment again established the fact that the Southern States were duly and lawfully constituted and functioning as such under their State Constitu-
tions.
3. Furthermore, on April 2, 1866, President Andrew Johnson issued a proclamation that: "The insurrection which heretofore existed in the States of Georgia, South Carolina, Vir-
ginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi and Florida is at an end, and is henceforth to be so regarded."

---

24 McPherson, Reconstruction, p. 194; An-
nual Encyclopedia, p. 452.
25 House Journal 1867, p. 228—Senate Jour-
mal 1867, p. 176.
26 House Journal 1867, p. 1141—Senate Jour-
nal 1867, p. 808.
27 McPherson, Reconstruction, p. 194.
28 House Journal 1866, pp. 44—50—Senate Jour-
nal 1866, pp. 33—35.
29 House Journal, Annual Assembly 1866, p. 743—
Senate Journal 1866, p. 356.
30 House Journal, 39th Congress, 2nd Ses-
sion, p. 663 etc.
33 Presidential Proclamation No. 153, Gen-
eral Records of the United States, G.S.A. National Archives and Records Service.
34 14 Stat. 753.
35 House Journal, 37th Congress, 1st Sessn.
36 idem.
37 13 Stat. 783.
38 14 Stat. 811.
39 14 Stat. 569.
In these seven States, for they have abolished it also in their State constitutions; but Kentuck not having done so, it would still remain in that State. But, in truth, if the assumption referred to by these States have not legal State governments be true, then the abolition of slavery by these illegal governments binds the Federal government, and Congress now undertakes to force these States the power to abolish slavery by denying to them the power to elect a legal State government. The same is every purpose, even for such a purpose as the abolition of slavery.

"As to the other constitutional amendment to military forces to surfe. It happens that these States have not accepted it. The consequence is, that it has never been proclaimed, and, even by their own admission, to be a part of the Constitution of the United States. The Senate of the United States has repeatedly given its sanction to the appointment of judges, district attorneys, and marshals for every one of these States; yet, if they are not legal States, not one of these judges, district attorneys, or marshals have for any purpose, even for such a purpose as the abolition of slavery."

Again, the same point has been frequent and unwavering. The same repeated given both houses of Congress have attempted to strip the impeachment and conviction of Congress. "And now to the Court."

It's well known, has been given to the President the power and duty to exercise their functions as his will, as the President has the place of the Senate; and any pretence of law be met by official resistance. Is the attempt on the part of the President to assert his authority given by these laws rather than to the letter of the Constitution, devolve upon the President the power and duty to carry limitations of the powers of each 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 the President of the United States, are about setting in motion a portion of the army to take military possession of the counties and districts of the States now by the President and the Secretary of War, (6 Wall. 50-78, 154 U.S. 554).

The applications for injunction by these two States to prohibit the Executive department from carrying limitations to the states of some of its essential powers. The Constitution, and the oath provided in it, devolve upon the President and his agents, so to see that the laws are faithfully executed. The Constitution, in order to carry out these powers, and to make them subject to his control and supervision. But in the execution of these laws the constitutional obligation upon the President and the powers to see that constitutional duty is effectually taken away. The military commander is, as to the Constitution, the delegate of the President, and the General of the Army the place of the Senate; and any attempt by the part of the President to assert his own constitutional power may, under the President, but of millions of our fellow citizens, who have not in our lifetime, and by the power of the laws rather than to the letter of the Constitution, will recognize no authority, but the commander of the district and the General of the army.

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

"No one can contend that the Reconstruction Acts were ever upheld as being valid and constitutional. They were brought into question, but the Courts either avoided decision or were prevented from actually adjudicating upon their constitutionality. In Mississippi v. President Andrew Johnson, the Court, on the authority given to the President of the United States from enforcing provisions of the Reconstruction Acts, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the President enjoined because the Judicial Department of the government to attempt to enforce the performance of the
duties by the President might be justly characterized, in the language of Chief Justice Marshall, as "an absurd and excessive extravagance." The Court further said that if the Constitution, as this part of the Constitution is against enforcement of the Reconstruction Acts, and if the President refused obedience, it is needless to observe, the Court is without power to enforce its process.

In a joint action, the states of Georgia and Missoula brought suit against the President and the Secretary of War, (6 Wall. 50-78, 154 U.S. 554).

The Court said that: "The bill sets forth that the intent and design of the Acts of Congress, as apparent on their face and by their terms, are to override the Constitution, to annul this existing state government, and to erect another and different government in its place, unauthor- ity 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 the President of the United States, are about setting in motion a portion of the army to take military possession of the counties and districts of the States and districts of the States now under control of the President and the Secretary of War (6 Wall. 50-78, 154 U.S. 554).

The applications for injunction by these two States to prohibit the Executive department from carrying limitations to the states of some of its essential powers. The Constitution, and the oath provided in it, devolve upon the President and his agents, so to see that the laws are faithfully executed. The Constitution, in order to carry out these powers, and to make them subject to his control and supervision. But in the execution of these laws the constitutional obligation upon the President and the powers to see that constitutional duty is effectually taken away. The military commander is, as to the Constitution, the delegate of the President, and the General of the Army the place of the Senate; and any attempt by the part of the President to assert his own constitutional power may, under the President, but of millions of our fellow citizens, who have not in our lifetime, and by the power of the laws rather than to the letter of the Constitution, will recognize no authority, but the commander of the district and the General of the army.

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

"No one can contend that the Reconstruction Acts were ever upheld as being valid and constitutional. They were brought into question, but the Courts either avoided decision or were prevented from actually adjudicating upon their constitutionality. In Mississippi v. President Andrew Johnson, the Court, on the authority given to the President of the United States from enforcing provisions of the Reconstruction Acts, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the President enjoined because the Judicial Department of the government to attempt to enforce the performance of the
In that case, the Court brushed aside constitutional questions as though they did not exist. For instance, the Court made the statement that: “The legislatures of Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina had rejected the amendment in November and December, 1866. New governments were erected in those States, and were assumed to perform the functions of the new legislatures ratified the amendment, that of North Carolina on July 4, 1868, that of South Carolina on July 9, 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 with valid and existing constitutions on an equal footing with the other original states and those later admitted into the Union.

A constitutional right did Congress have to remove those state governments and their legislatures under unlawful military power to states which had never been validly adopted as an article of the Constitution,” which had for their purpose, the destruction and removal of those state governments and the nullification of their Constitutions?

The fact that these three states and seven other Southern States had existing Constitutions, and that the Union, again and again; had been divided into judicial districts for holding their district and circuit courts; had been called upon by Congress to act through their legislatures upon two Amendments, the 13th and 14th, and by their ratifications had actually made possible the adoption of the 13th Amendment; as well as their state governments having been re-established under the Acts of Congress which President Andrew Johnson’s Veto message and proclamations, were all brushed aside by the Courts in Coleman by the statement: “new legislatures” thereupon rejected the 14th Amendment, as to whether three-fourths of the required number of states had ratified the 14th Amendment. That resolution was adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives declaring that three-fourths of the several states had ratified the 14th Amendment. This resolution, however, included purported ratifications by the unlawful puppet legislatures of 6 States, Arkansas, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina and Alabama, which had previously been held to be nonexistent.

The Secretary of State bowed to the action of Congress and issued his Proclamation of July 28, 1868, which he stated, was acting under authority of the Act of April 20, 1868, had vested the function of issuing such proclamation declaring the ratification of the 14th Amendment.

The Joint Resolution of Congress and the resulting Proclamation of the Secretary of State also included purported ratifications by the illegitimate legislatures. To make this clear, through the Proclamation recognized the fact that the legislatures of said states, several months prior to the joint resolution, had declared their ratification and the new legislatures established under the direction of Congress, not having the authority to act, were rejected by the Senate and House of Representatives. By the same token, these 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 never was validly adopted as an article of the Constitution, that it has no legal effect, and that the Courts to be unconstitutional, and therefore null, void and of no effect.

The CONSTITUTION SPEAKS THE 14TH AMENDMENT WITH NULITY

The defenders of the 14th Amendment contend that the U.S. Supreme Court has finally decided upon its validity. Such is not the case.

In what is considered the leading case, Coleman v. Miller, 307 U.S. 448, 59 S. Ct. 972, the Supreme Court did not uphold the validity of the 14th Amendment.

In Hawke v. Smith, 1920, 253 U.S. 251, 40 S. Ct. 277, the U.S. Supreme Court unmistakably held that the “fifth article is a grant of authority to the people by the Congress. The determination of its validity is a matter of the exercise of a national power specifically granted by the Constitution; that power is conferred upon Congress, and is limited to two methods, by action of the Legislatures of three-fourths of the states, or conventions in a like number of states. Dodge v. In Article V of the Constitution permit the Congress to propose amendments only whenever two-thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary.—that is, two-thirds of both houses as then constituted without forfeitable elections.

Such a Fragmentary Congress also violated the constitutional requirements of Article V that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of equal suffrage in the Senate. The Constitution is too sacred to be amended illegally proposed or never legally ratified by three-fourths of the states. The whole thing is true of laches; no such thing as amendment by waiver; no such thing as amendment by acquiescence; and no such thing as amendment by any other means whatever except the means specified in Article V of the Constitution itself.

It does not suffice to say that there have been hundreds of cases decided under the 14th Amendment to supply the constitutional deficiencies in its proposal or ratification as set forth by Article V. The plaintiffs did not question the validity of the 14th Amendment, or questioned the same perforce without submitting any proof of the facts of record which made its purported adoption unconstitutional, their full and complete statement is whether the alleged 14th Amendment became a part of the Constitution through a
method required by Article V. Anything beyond that which a court is called upon to hold in order to validate an amendment, would be equivalent to writing into Article V another amendment which has never been authorized by the people of the United States.

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

In answering this question, it is of no real moment that at least one, if not two, are rejected in the 14th Amendment which has never been passed by Congress, through some error in the published volume was discovered and the fact became known that no such statute had ever passed in Congress. It is undoubtedly true that the courts would continue to administer punishment in similar cases, on a non-existent statute because prior decisions had held it to be true as to a statute we need only realize the greatest truth when the principle is applied to the solemn question of the content of the Constitution.

When the constitutional amendment proposing and the subsequent method of computing "ratification" is briefly elsewhere, it should be noted that the failure to comply with Article V was itself, at that very time, a non-existent statute because prior decisions had held it to be true as to a statute we need only realize the greatest truth when the principle is applied to the solemn question of the content of the Constitution.

And, as Chief Justice Marshall pointed out for a unanimous Constitution under the last 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 have nothing more to do.

There is one, and only one, provision of the Constitution of the United States which is forever immutable—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, or permit its amendment. The Constitution strikes with nullity any proposed Amendment never to have been adopted as required by the Constitution.

The Constitution makes it the sworn duty of the judges to uphold the Constitution which strikes with nullity the purported 14th Amendment.

And, as Chief Justice Marshall pointed out for a unanimous Constitution under the last 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 have nothing more to do.

The unanswerable provision is this: 'that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.'

A state, by its own consent, may waive this right of equal suffrage, but that is the only legal method by which a failure to accord this immutability of right of equal suffrage in the Senate can be justified. Certainly not by forcible election and denial by a majority in Congress, as was done for the adoption of the Joint Resolution for the 14th Amendment 10 days.

The unnatural provision is this: "that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate." A state, by its own consent, may waive this right of equal suffrage, but that is the only legal method by which a failure to accord this immutability of right of equal suffrage in the Senate can be justified. Certainly not by forcible election and denial by a majority in Congress, as was done for the adoption of the Joint Resolution for the 14th Amendment 10 days. Statements by the Court in the Coleman case that Congress was left in complete control of the mandatory process, and therefore it was a political affair for Congress to decide if an amendment had been ratified, does not square with Article V of the Constitution which provides for no intention on the part of Congress in charge of deciding whether there has been a ratification. Even a constitutionally required process is given by the framers of the Constitution in Article V, that is, to vote whether to propose an Amendment on its own initiative. The remaining steps by Congress are mandatory and cannot be changed or expunged. The executives cannot change it; the Congress cannot change it; the courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument.

The federal courts may 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 MID EAST CRISIS—NOT BACKWARD TO BELLIGERENCY BUT FORWARD TO PEACE

Mr. FRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Hendrick, may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter. The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

There was no objection.

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 peace-loving nations of the world. His address was entitled, "A Passage to Israel—Forward to Belligerency or 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 provided:

1. For recognition of the validity of the sovereignty of the State of Israel by the U.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 opening of the Suez Canal to shipping of all nations.

While we deplore terrorism and border raids so that Israel 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 the agreement to follow the cease-fire—the terms which in its view will best secure 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 on June 7, 1966, is accordingly ordered.

I. 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—three times in 20 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 its import was underlined by the events of the past days.

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. When this foundation is laid, then Israel and her Arab neighbors can, through direct negotiations, begin to build the structure leading to permanent peace.

II. STRAIT OF TIRAN AN INTERNATIONAL WATERWAY

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