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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.

Here 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 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 his remarks at this point in the Record and include an excerpt 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 rejected 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 and agreement 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 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 the purpose only to preclude a quasi-legal approach for overthrow of the tender balances and protections of limitation found in the Constitution itself.

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 and never 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 secessionists—guns 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 Legislature 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—was but 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 Congress of the United States; 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 the 14th amendment had been ratified; and to provide for the distribution of certified copies of this resolution

Whereas the purported 14th Amendment to the United States was never lawfully adopted in accordance with the requirements of the United States Constitution because states of the Union were deprived of their equal suffrage in the Senate in violation of Article V, when eleven southern states, including Louisiana, were excluded from deliberation and decision in the adoption of the Joint Resolution proposing the said 14th Amendment; said Resolution of the United States in order that the same should take effect, as required by Article I, Section 7; the proposed amendment was not ratified by three-fourths of the states, but to the contrary fifteen states of the then thirty-seven states of the Union rejected the proposed 14th Amendment, and to uphold and support the Constitution of the United States which strikes said 14th Amendment with nullity; and

(1) That the Joint Resolution proposing said amendment was not submitted to or adopted by a Constitutional Congress. Article I, Section 7, and Article V of the United States Constitution; and

(2) That no amendments, previous or future, can validly be rejected by the People without first satisfying the constitutional requirement of ratification by three-fourths of the states; and

(3) That Congress is without power to institute such regulations for the admission of new States as shall make any amendment to the Constitution inoperative; and

(4) That the Congress of the United States is without power to legislate in violation of the Constitution of the United States or to pass any legislation for the admission of any new States; and

(5) That copies of this Resolution, duly certified, together with a copy of the treatise on "The Unconstitutionality of the 14th Amendment" by Judge L. H. Perez, be forwarded to the Governor and Legislative Delegation of each state of the Union, and to the Congress of the United States, and to the President for his approval. Article I, Section 7.

THE 14TH AMENDMENT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The proposed 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution is and should be held to be ineffective, invalid, null, 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 7, and Article V of the United States Constitution.

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

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

THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONGRESS

The U.S. Constitution provides:

Article I, Section 3. "The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the Legislature thereof. Article V provides: "No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The fact that 23 Senators had been unlawfully excluded from the U.S. Senate, in order to secure a two-thirds vote for adoption of the 14th Amendment is shown by Resolutions of pro-
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June 13, 1867

The New Jersey Legislature by Resolution of March 27, 1868, adopted the following:

"The said proposed amendment not having yet received the assent of the three-fourths of the States necessary to its adoption by Congress, is hereby declared to be invalid, the natural and constitutional right of this State to withdraw its assent is undeniable.

"The necessity being necessary by the constitution that every amendment to the same should be proposed by two-thirds of both houses of Congress, to the authors of said proposition, for the purpose of securing the assent of the requisite majority, determined to, and did, exclude from the said two houses eight representatives from eleven States of the Union, upon the pretense that there were no such States in the Union; but, finding that the exclusion of the said eight representatives from the Congress could not be brought to assent to the said proposition, they deliberately formed and effectually by fraud andburns, by a majority of the members elected, and of the representatives of another portion, the Constitution. In consequence of this, these States had no voice on the important question of proposing the Amendment. Had they been allowed to pass this proposition, the void would inevitably have commanded 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 proposing it to the States; for it woul be difficult, in the opinion of the Committee, to show by what process in 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 he may approve such order, resolution, or vote, or any part thereof, or he may return it, with his objections, to that branch, which sent it back to him, for further action on the same subject; and such return shall be made within ten days ( Sundays excepted) after it is received, and before the second meeting of the Congress at which such bill shall be then in session; unless the President of the United States shall, within said ten days ( Sundays excepted), return such bill, or any part thereof, to that house in which it shall then be, with his objections; and such house shall disagree to the return of the President, by procuring two thirds of the members elected to be absent from the sitting of the house, may override the President's veto; but the vote therein necessary to aOverride the President's veto shall not be less than two thirds of the whole number elected."

The Joint Resolution proposing the 14th Amendment was never presented to the President of the United States, and his approval, as President Andrew Johnson stated in his message on June 22, 1866, "Therefore, the Resolution will have no effect.

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 15, 1866 and March 24, 1868, thereby nullifying said resolution and making it impossible for its ratification by the constitutionally required three-fourths of such States, as shown by the rejections thereof by the Legislatures of the following States:

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

Georgia rejected the 14th Amendment on November 9, 1866.

Florida rejected the 14th Amendment on December 6, 1866.

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

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

Arkansas rejected the 14th Amendment on December 17, 1866.

South Carolina rejected the 14th Amendment on December 20, 1866.

Kentucky rejected the 14th Amendment on January 8, 1867.
On August 20, 1865, President Andrew Johnson issued another proclamation pointing out the fact that the House of Represent­ations of the Southern States, adopted identically the Reconstruction Acts of July 22nd and July 29th, 1861, that the Civil War forced by disloyalty of the Southern States, was not waged for the purpose of conquest or to overthrow the rights and established institu­tions of those States, 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 when the Confederate States were recon­stituted, the war ought to cease. The Presi­dent's proclamation on June 13, 1866, de­clared that the Southern States of Ten­nessee had been suppressed. The Presi­dent's proclamation on April 2, 1866, declared the insurrection in the Southern States, except Texas, no longer existed. On August 20, 1866, the President pro­claimed that the insurrection in the State of Texas had been completely ended; and his proclamation continued: "the insurrection herefore existed in the State of Texas, and is to be hereafter so regarded in that State, as in the other States before named in which the said Insurrection was proclaimed to be at an end, and that peace, order, tranquility, and civil authority now exist, in all parts of the whole of the United States of America."

4. When the State of Louisiana rejected the 14th Amendment on February 7, 1867, the 14th State to have rejected the same, or more than one-fourth of the total number of 36 States of the Union as of that date, the Senate and the House had no power to ratify the same, and Congress was to act in the same manner as Congress was to act when the amendments to the Constitution are ratified by the States. On July 22, 1867, President Andrew Johnson issued his proclamation declaring the insurrection in the other Southern States to have ended and that peace, order, tranquility, and civil authority now exist in all parts of these States.

5. Faced with the positive failure of rati­fication of the 14th Amendment, both Houses of Congress passed over the veto of the Presi­dent. They passed the Reconstruction Acts, between the dates of March 2 and July 29, 1867, especially the third of said Acts, 15 Stat. p. 145, designed illegally to remove with "military force" the lawfully constituted State Legislatures of the 10 Southern States of the Union, and the establishment of federal councils and circuits.

6. Faced with the positive failure of rati­fication of the 14th Amendment, both Houses of Congress passed over the veto of the Presi­dent. They passed the Reconstruction Acts, between the dates of March 2 and July 29, 1867, especially the third of said Acts, 15 Stat. p. 145, designed illegally to remove with "military force" the lawfully constituted State Legislatures of the 10 Southern States of the Union, and the establishment of federal councils and circuits.

"In all these States there are existing consti­tutions, framed in the accustomed way by the people. Congress, however, declares that these constitutions are not States of the Union, and that they shall be known as the 'loyal and republican' movement for the establishment of State 'loyal and republican.'" The President's act answers the question: 'It is universal negro suffrage or no government at all.' Congress leaves exclusively to the States themselves. All this legislative machinery of martial law, military coercion, and political management is a universal recognition for a new purpose and none other. The existing constitu­tions of the ten States conform to the acc­tedary forms of government, their constitu­tions 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 mes­sage on the Reconstruction Act on July 19, 1867, he pointed out various constitu­tionality as follows:

"The veto of the original bill of the 2d of March was based on two distinct grounds, the interference of Congress in matters concerning the domestic concerns of the States, and the establishment of military tribunals for the trial of citizens in time of peace in the States.

"A singular contradiction is apparent here. Congress declares these local State govern­ments to be illegal governments, and then provides that these illegal governments shall be carried on by federal officers, who are to perform the very duties on its own officers by this illegal authority. It certainly would be a novel spectacle if Congress should attempt to carry on a State government by the agency of its own officers, is yet more strange that Congress attempts to sus­tain 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 of this Union. Declarations to the contrary made in these three acts are contradicted again and again by repeated acts of legislation enacted by Congress from the year 1861 to the year 1867.

"During that period, while these States were in actual rebellion, and after that re­bellion was brought to an end, they have been again and again recognized as States of the Union. Representation has been appor­tioned to them as States were divided into judicial districts for the holding of districts and circuit courts of the United States, as States of the Union only can be distric­ted. The last act on this subject was passed July 23, 1866, by which every one of these ten States was arranged into districts and circuits.

"They have been called upon by Congress to act through their legislatures upon at least two amendments to the Constitution of the United States. As States they have rati­fied one amendment, which required the vote of twenty-seven States of the thirty-six then composing the Union. When the requisite twenty-seven votes were given in favor of that amendment—seven of which were given by these ten States—it was proclaimed to be a part of the Constitution of the United States, and slavery was declared no longer to exist within the United States subject to their jurisdiction. If these seven States were not legal States of the Union, it follows as an inevitable consequence that none of the States slavery yet exist. It does not exist
In these seven States, for they have abolished in these seven States, for they have abolished State governments be true, then the abolition of slavery by these illegal governments binds the legal governments in these States the power to abolish slavery by denying to them the power to elect a legal State legislature, or to frame a constitution for any purpose, even for such a purpose as the abolition of slavery.

As to the other constitutional amendment to which reference is made to sustain. It happens that these States have not accepted it. The consequence is, that it has never been proclaimed, and, even by the States themselves, 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 Attorney, or Marshal has been elected by the citizens of these States. Both houses of Congress have passed appropriation bills to pay all these judges, attorneys, and marshals of the United States for exercising their functions in these States. Again, in the machinery of the internal revenue laws, all these States are distracted, not as States, but as Territories.

So much for continuous legislative recognition. The instances cited, however, fall far short of what might be endured under a constitutional Executive, as is well known, has been frequent and unwavering. The same may be said as to judicial recognition through the Supreme Court of the United States. The Court has to try 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 Court granted the President's prayer, it would be against enforcement of the Reconstruction Acts, and if the President refused obedience, it is needless to observe that the Court is without power to enforce its process.

In a joint action, the states of Georgia and Mississippi brought suit against President and the Secretary of War, (6 Wall. 50-78, 15 U.S.C. 554).

The Court said that:

"The bill then 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 of each State, and to erect another and different government 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 the General of the Navy, have in a joint action, the states of Georgia and Mississippi brought suit against President and the Secretary of War, (6 Wall. 50-78, 15 U.S.C. 554).

The applications for injunction by these two states to prohibit the Executive Department of the United States from enforcing the provisions of the Reconstruction Acts directed to the overthrow of their government, including this dissolution of their state legislatures, were denied on the grounds that the organization of the government into three great departments, the executive, legislative, and judicial, carried limitations on the powers of each by the Constitution. This case when the same way as the previous case of Mississippi against President Johnson and was dismissed without adjudicating upon the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts.

In another case, ex parte William H. McCord (7 Wall. 506-515), a petition for the writ of habeas corpus for unlawful restraint by military force of a citizen not in the military service of the United States that the government of the United States; and she therefore insists that such protection can, and ought to be afforded by a decree or order of his court in the premises.

The applications for injunction by these two states to prohibit the Executive Department of the United States from enforcing the provisions of the Reconstruction Acts directed to the overthrow of their government, including this dissolution of their state legislatures, were denied on the grounds that the organization of the government into three great departments, the executive, legislative, and judicial, carried limitations on the powers of each by the Constitution. This case when the same. way as the previous case of Mississippi against President Johnson and was dismissed without adjudicating upon the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts.

In another case, ex parte William H. McCord (7 Wall. 506-515), a petition for the writ of habeas corpus for unlawful restraint by military force of a citizen not in the military service of the United States that the government of the United States; and she therefore insists that such protection can, and ought to be afforded by a decree or order of his court in the premises.

The applications for injunction by these two states to prohibit the Executive Department of the United States from enforcing the provisions of the Reconstruction Acts directed to the overthrow of their government, including this dissolution of their state legislatures, were denied on the grounds that the organization of the government into three great departments, the executive, legislative, and judicial, carried limitations on the powers of each by the Constitution. This case when the same way as the previous case of Mississippi against President Johnson and was dismissed without adjudicating upon the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts.

In another case, ex parte William H. McCord (7 Wall. 506-515), a petition for the writ of habeas corpus for unlawful restraint by military force of a citizen not in the military service of the United States that the government of the United States; and she therefore insists that such protection can, and ought to be afforded by a decree or order of his court in the premises.

The applications for injunction by these two states to prohibit the Executive Department of the United States from enforcing the provisions of the Reconstruction Acts directed to the overthrow of their government, including this dissolution of their state legislatures, were denied on the grounds that the organization of the government into three great departments, the executive, legislative, and judicial, carried limitations on the powers of each by the Constitution. This case when the same way as the previous case of Mississippi against President Johnson and was dismissed without adjudicating upon the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts.

In another case, ex parte William H. McCord (7 Wall. 506-515), a petition for the writ of habeas corpus for unlawful restraint by military force of a citizen not in the military service of the United States that the government of the United States; and she therefore insists that such protection can, and ought to be afforded by a decree or order of his court in the premises.

The applications for injunction by these two states to prohibit the Executive Department of the United States from enforcing the provisions of the Reconstruction Acts directed to the overthrow of their government, including this dissolution of their state legislatures, were denied on the grounds that the organization of the government into three great departments, the executive, legislative, and judicial, carried limitations on the powers of each by the Constitution. This case when the same way as the previous case of Mississippi against President Johnson and was dismissed without adjudicating upon the constitutionality of the Reconstruction Acts.
Arkansas, North Carolina, Louisiana, South Carolina and Georgia.

Those Reconstruction Acts of Congress and all acts and things unlawfully done thereunder are the rejection of Article V of the Constitution, which required the United States to guarantee every State in the Union a republican form of government. Two years later, the Articles of Confederation were superseded by the Constitution, Article I, Section 3, and Article V of the Constitution, which entitled every State in the Union to representation by two Senators in the Senate of Congress, and by one Representative in the House of Representatives, and to the enjoyment of all the rights and privileges of branches and members of the Federal Government, and to their votes as such branches and members, under the Constitution, and to their votes as such branches and members, under the Constitution, which for the time being represented the State in Congress, and which was acting under authority of the Acts of April 20, 1818, pursuant to said Resolution of March 27, 1818.

The Secretary of State bowed to the action of Congress and issued his Proclamation of July 21, 1868, in which he stated that the states that had ratified the 14th Amendment, including the purported ratification of the unlawful puppet legislatures of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, were recognized by Congress by its admission of the State of Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina as the Southern States and the new legislatures that they had erected in the territories that had been part of those states, to be on an equal footing with the other States of the Union.

The Joint Resolution of Congress and the resulting Proclamation of the Secretary of State also included purported ratifications by the States of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, which were recognized by Congress as state governments with the same rights and privileges as the other States of the Union, and which were admitted by Congress as States to Congress, and the new legislatures that they had erected in the territories that had been part of those States, to be on an equal footing with the other States of the Union.

In that case, the Court struck down the constitutionality of the amendment, as well as the laws that it had been used to enact, on the ground that the amendment had been adopted in violation of the requirements of the Constitution. The Court held that the amendment had been adopted in violation of the requirements of the Constitution, and that the laws that it had been used to enact were unconstitutional.
method required by Article V. Anything beyond that which a court is called upon to decide 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 the 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 the amendments which have been rendered in the form that the parties desired, submitted proper evidence, or that the Court assumed that the Amendment which they submitted to the Court never in fact passed by Congress, through some error of administration and printing got into the published reports of the statute, 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 unnecessary to say that the Courts would continue to administer punishment in similar cases, on a non-existent statute because prior decisions had been given as to its nature as a statute; we need only realize the greater truth that when the principle is applied to the solemn question of the content of the Constitution.

Moreover, the method of propounding and the subsequent method of computing ratification is briefed elsewhere. It should be noted that Article V itself was followed by the first action by Congress. The very Congress which proposed the ratification Amendment 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 not be the first to be so done.

There is one, and only one, provision of the Constitution of the United States which is forever immutable, which cannot be changed or expunged. The Courts 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 the Constitution which can never be changed or expunged. The Courts 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 the Constitution which can never be changed or expunged. The Courts 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 the Constitution which can never be changed or expunged. The Courts 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 the Constitution which can never be changed or expunged. The Courts 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 the Constitution which can never be changed or expunged.

The unalterable 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 accredit this immeasurable 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 years ago.

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 gives the Congress no intention to vest Congress in charge of deciding whether there has been a ratification. Even a constitutionally valid Amendment is given the same effect as a statute in Article V of the Constitution, which is to vote whether to propose an Amendment on its own initiative. The remaining steps by Congress are mandatory, and either both houses or both houses and the President must deem it necessary, Congress shall propose amendments; if the Legislatures of two-thirds of the states make application, Congress shall call a convention. For the Court to give Congress any power beyond that to be found in Article V is to write the new material into Article V.

It would be inconceivable that the Congress of the United States could propose, by its own suffrage, group and give life to an invalid amendment by resolving that its effort had succeeded—regardless of compliance with the positive provisions of Article V.

It should need no further citations to sustain the proposition that neither the Joint Resolution procedure, nor the 14th Amendment nor its ratification by the required three-fourths of the States in the Union were in compliance with the requirements of Article V of the Constitution.

When the mandatory provisions of the Constitution itself strike with nullity the Act that did violence to its provisions, thus, the Constitution strikes with nullity the purported 14th Amendment.

The Courts, bound by oath to support the Constitution, should review all of the evidence herein submitted and measure the facts proving violations of the mandatory provisions of the Constitution with Article V, and finally render judgment declaring said purported 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 14th Amendment, and, as Chief Justice Marshall pointed out for a unanimous Court in Marbury v. Madison (1 Cranch 137) :

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

And, as Chief Justice Marshall pointed out for a unanimous Court in Marbury v. Madison (1 Cranch 137) :

"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 to take this oath, becomes equally a crime."

"Thus, the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confines and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions • • • there can be no chance of a convention to be used as a forum for agitation upon any objects whatever."

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. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Tenzer) may extend 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. 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, "Towards Peace and Freedom." He 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 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 Straights of Tiran.

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

With the ending of 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 it will accept 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