

United States Supreme Court is presently constituted with Rehnquist, whom Richard Nixon, when he was appointing him, asked who is this S.O.B., Renchberg, but he appointed him anyway because they told him he has the proper troglodytish mentality. He will help you, Mr. Nixon, and those who follow you, in rolling back the tide of civil rights and civil liberties. He is in favor of the government having the upper hand over the citizen. In any controversy between the government and any citizen, the government must be allowed to prevail if through any twisting of the Constitution, stretching of a statute, or annulling of a statute that result can be achieved. When you speak of the Supreme Court as an abstraction or in academic terms, then you can become sentimental and think of it as the final bulwark against excesses of and by the government. But when the Supreme Court becomes the handmaiden to the government in various oppressive activities, then it ought to be criticized. There is nothing in the resolution that refers specifically to the present Supreme Court, which has seen as its duty the ruling against those people who have traditionally looked to the courts for protection of and vindication of their rights, rights guaranteed by the Constitution, supposedly; further buttressed by enactments of Congress, allegedly. Discrimination based on race and gender are compatible in a lot of instances with the Constitution of the United States based on the attitude of the majority who make up the present Supreme Court. When you talk about the Constitution, people of my ancestry must read that document differently from the way people of your ancestry would read it. There is nothing in the Constitution, as written, which says that for purposes of representation you shall constitute three-fifths of a human being. That is the first reference to people of my kind. There is no provision in the Constitution that guarantees the importation of your people to be enslaved and bred like cows, pigs, and chickens, as there is in the Constitution relative to my kind. There is no provision in the Constitution which says if you are being held as a piece of property and you have the temerity and the wherewithal to escape to a state where that is not the practice, you must be given up by that state to be returned to shackles, the lash, and to that unending night of human slavery, but that exists in the Constitution with reference to my people. Then in Article V of the U.S. Constitution, there is a provision which probably nobody on this floor is aware of and certainly the people who explained the Constitution to me when I was in school never informed me of.