

# FOLLOW-UP

## APRIL 4, 2019 PRESENTATION

by

### Lester Jackson PhD

**NOTE:** Regrettably, due to technical and time constraints, I was unable to provide a complete presentation in the manner I would have preferred. Accordingly, I thank QVGOP President Phil Orenstein for graciously allowing me to post the following supplemental comments, links and additional largely unknown shocking examples from my book, *Equal Justice for Victims*. The numbers in parentheses refer to pages in the book. Please contact me at [lackson@justice.com](mailto:lackson@justice.com) with any comments or questions you might have. If you wish to purchase the book, also please contact me directly.

Lester Jackson, PhD.

#### **Coker v. Georgia**

1. For those who can't believe what I said (that people who believe in "unharmful" rape can end up on the highest court in the country), here are links to the official US Reports pages:

**RAPE UNHARMFUL?** ["Mrs Carver was unharmed."](#)

vs.

**DISSENT** by Chief Justice Burger: ["This bifurcation of rape into categories of harmful and non-harmful eludes my comprehension."](#)

2. In a major blow against representative self-government (one of many; see: 170, 195-207), the Supreme Court seized power from 300 million Americans to decide what punishments for violent crimes are "acceptable": ["the Constitution contemplates that in the end our own judgment](#) [i.e., the judgment of any five lawyers who, by sheer chance, happened to land on the Supreme Court] [will be brought to bear on the question of the acceptability of the death penalty under the Eighth Amendment."](#)

(a) 31 years later, Justice Scalia observed: ["Of course the Constitution contemplates no such thing..."](#) He [added](#) that the Framers would have scornfully laughed at any such claim.

3. *Coker v. Georgia* **dishonestly usurped** the people's genuine and "most fundamental" Constitutional right to representative self-government (195) by fantasizing a fairy tale "Constitutional right" to immunity from any and all punishment for the most "depraved human beings like Coker" (192, 312).

4. *Coker v. Georgia* is discussed repeatedly in my book. See especially page 178n, which summarizes why *Coker v. Georgia* is one of the most dishonest, anti-woman, pro-criminal, anti-victim, anti-public safety and anti-Constitutional decisions ever handed down by the Supreme Court.

5. When *Coker* was decided, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg was still a practicing lawyer. She [filed a brief](#) on behalf of rapist-murderer Coker, arguing that it was unconstitutional to punish him for the violent rape of Mrs. Carver. (191) In 2008, [Ginsburg provided the fifth vote](#) to [unconstitutionally](#) declare unconstitutional the death penalty for 300-pound men who rape 8-year-old girls.

So much for the feminist claptrap that women will stand up for the interests of women. Ginsburg herself has argued for an all-female Supreme Court (306n) and has pretended to be a leading feminist. Three consistently anti-rape victim justices on today's Court are females: Ginsburg, Sonia Sotomayor and Elena Kagan. For more on Ginsburg and Sotomayor, see [here](#) and [here](#), as well as the book index.

#### **PROTECTING CRIMINALS AT EXPENSIVE OF SAFETY OF THE LAW-ABIDING PUBLIC**

The so-called "exclusionary rule" was not applied even to the federal government until 1914, 123 years after the Bill of Rights was ratified. However, because most violent crimes are prosecuted in state courts, that was not a major threat to public safety. The major Supreme Court assault against the Constitution and the safety of decent, law abiding people did not come until 1961. Twelve years after rejecting a bid to protect the worst clearly guilty criminals, a slim pro-criminal majority finally applied the "exclusionary rule" to the states. This rule is familiar to all *Law and Order* fans; motions to suppress proof of guilt are a staple of that series.

Remember, evidence that is fake, irrelevant or unreliable always has been disallowed. It is only evidence that is reliable, relevant and probative of guilt that gets “suppressed” under the exclusionary rule. So if the police make a mistake and barge into a home lacking evidence of a crime, the only recourse is to sue the police – or, more accurately, their employers, the taxpayers. It is only guilty, often depraved criminals who receive from the Supreme Court the extra reward of having evidence of their guilt thrown out. Those really punished for police mistakes are the next victims of violent criminals turned loose on orders from the Supreme Court.

[“There has been no blinking the consequences. The criminal is to go free because the constable has blundered.”](#)

---Benjamin Cardozo, 1926

In 1949, Justice Felix Frankfurter, wrote for the Supreme Court in [Wolf v. Colorado](#): “exclusion of evidence ... serves only to protect those upon whose person or premises something incriminating has been found.” Innocent people whose privacy has been violated may sue the taxpayers for any “official lawlessness” of their employees, the police, but they cannot reap the special court-created benefit of being freed despite clear proof of guilt of the most brutal crimes. It is the future victims of clearly guilty freed barbarians who are punished, not the police.

In 1961, Frankfurter’s position was [rejected by a bare majority of five justices](#) dishonestly contending that the exclusionary rule protected “all persons.” Even the next victims of freed clearly guilty violent criminals?

As recently as three years ago, Justices [Kagan and Ginsburg touted](#) the alleged “societal benefits” of the exclusionary rule’s “crucial function—to deter unconstitutional police conduct.” However, long ago, Sidney Hook pointed out (127, 207) what is obvious to all but activist political Supreme Court justices: most people are far more likely to be victims than criminals and, hence, far more likely to fear criminals far more than the police.

## **IMMIGRATION AND CRIME**

When an alien enters the United States in violation of this country’s criminal laws, he or she is, by definition, a criminal. That itself is sufficient reason to keep out criminal illegals.

However, President Trump has argued forcefully that illegals commit murders out of all proportion to their numbers. That is true. But I stress this point. Over 95% of murders in the United States have been and are committed by home grown barbarians. The real problem, as I pointed out in my April 4 presentation, is that right now anyone contemplating murder is comforted by a pro-murderer ruling class that has spared no effort to assured homicidal Americans that they have a 99.83% chance of robbing innocent people of their lives without sacrificing their own.

Unless the remedies proposed in my book (Part III) are adopted, this will not change. As a talking point to stem the invasion by illegal immigrants, President Trump is correct to use the threat to public safety posed by illegal immigrants. However, no one should think that the murders will miraculously stop without exposing and taking on the dishonest, pro-murderer, fanatic federal judges who protect murderers.

I discuss this point in greater detail [here](#) and [here](#).

## **SAFETY IN NUMBERS—FOR THE MOST DEPRAVED. (328)**

(1) As the number and severity of depraved acts by a single miscreant goes up, his “eligibility” for punishment goes down. Obviously, this is contrary to the widely-held commonsense view that a bad criminal record should increase rather than reduce punishment for a crime.

(2) Justices require that every convicted murderer be individually considered as a “dignified” human being, but also that his individual depravity must be ignored as the number of other individuals who have committed the same depraved act goes up. In other words, as the number of individuals who commit the same act grows, the lower the “eligibility” for harsh punishment for that act goes down, lest we subject too many of them to harsh punishment.

**\$100 reward for anyone who can find a “safety in numbers” clause in the U.S. Constitution!!**

Although dishonest pro-murderer Supreme Court justices lie one way and then another about the Constitution, law and facts, they have one clearly consistent guiding principle: select whatever lie about facts or law will save the life of anyone convicted of barbaric violence against one or more innocent human beings. (250-252)

**Why capital punishment should be imposed on ALL convicted intentional murderers. (book, 138-155)**

## WHAT CAN BE DONE

This no place for detailed repetition of Part III of my book. But I do stress that, contrary to what many believe, no constitutional amendment is necessary. (219-221) Congress and the President already have ample, indeed overwhelming, Constitutional powers to deal with dishonest and arrogant politician judges. *The central problem is not a lack of Constitutional power but a lack of will power.* The most daunting task is not to add to unused immense existing powers but to give Congress and the President the backbone to use those powers.

### CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS OF CONGRESS

These are four key relevant provisions of the United States Constitution:

- I-9-7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by law.
- I-8-9: The Congress shall have Power ... *To constitute Tribunals inferior* to the supreme Court. [Emphasis added.]
- III-1: The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a *Compensation*, which *shall not be diminished* during their Continuance in Office. [Emphasis added.]
- III-2-2: In all Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction. *In all the other Cases* before mentioned, the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, *with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.* [Emphasis added.]

These provisions are listed and explained at pages 215-219.

\*\*\*\*\*

### GENERATING WILL POWER TO USE CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

Many commentators, if not most, believe good judicial appointments (208-213) will solve the problem of dishonest and arrogant judges. That is a pipedream ([here](#)). Chief Justice John Roberts long ago proved himself to be a dishonest politician. (Book, 39,103, 109, 187, 236-237; [here](#) and [here](#)) Justice Neil Gorsuch, much-lauded by President Trump, joined four pro-criminal leftist politician justices to save from deportation a criminal so bad that even the Obama Administration wanted to throw him out of the country. Gorsuch has been [described](#) by a front-line immigration official as a justice who “think[s] too much [but] know[s] too little.” Finally, Brett Kavanaugh’s first decision was to vote in favor of Planned Parenthood, the far-left corrupt organization that spent millions to smear him.

No, while judicial appointments are important , they will not undo the damage already done. (221-227) What must be done is to publicly delegitimize the judiciary (174ff., esp 193, 195ff), especially the Supreme Court, by publicizing (201) outrageous examples, such as those on the following page.

# SUPREME COURT: SHOCKINGLY UNBELIEVABLE EXAMPLES

[Numbers in parentheses refer to pages in book, *Equal Justice for Victims*.]

THE [REAL MEANING](#) of "EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW" [inscribed](#) at the top of US Supreme Court Building: ONE MURDERER'S LIFE IS WORTH FAR MORE THAN 584 TIMES THE LIFE OF HIS VICTIM; ONE LAW-ABIDING INNOCENT VICTIM'S LIFE IS WORTH FAR LESS THAN 0.17% OF MURDERER'S LIFE. (Explained: 93-96, 149)

Although the US Supreme Court calls its home America's Temple of Justice, it is really America's Temple of INjustice. (Cover, 217-218)

The media-concealed truth about dishonest protection of convicted intentional murderers by Supreme Court, which tortures victims and needlessly causes new violent crimes including rapes and murders. (Entire book)

Brazenly dishonest pro-murderer and pro-rapist US Supreme Court justices manipulate language. (252-256) For example:

(1) the same justices label as "adults" 16-year-old rape victims and 13-year-old pregnant girls (sufficiently "mature" to make abortion decision independently), but designate murderers nearly 18 and even 19 as "children" too immature to understand the immorality, unlawfulness and punishment for carefully planned premeditated murder. (189, 253, 327-328)

(2) to save the life of a person sentenced to death for depravity, he will either be viewed or not viewed as a "dignified" human being endowed with the humanity of an individual. (251)

A US Sup Ct "feminist" justice unapologetically defended arguing that, due to treatment of women half way round the world in Bangladesh, an escaped convicted rapist/ murderer should not be punished for raping a 16-year-old 3 weeks after giving birth!! (191-192)

Lester Jackson greatly reveres the late Justice Antonin Scalia. Yet he is highly critical of the late great justice. (69-74, 221-226, 196-200)

Pro-murderer United States Supreme Court justices express great passion for brutal convicted murderers but do not think murder victims are worth mentioning at all (190, 260)

A Supreme Court justice argues that Western Civilization depends on lawyers and judges. (334)

A fanatic pro-murderer United States Supreme Court justice seems to think monkey wrenches are parts of monkeys. (92)

Lester Jackson's EQUAL JUSTICE for VICTIMS explains how five US Supreme Court justices were a major cause of the rapid and massive increase in illegal immigration; and four justices want to give special rights to convicted foreign born murderers that American born murderers do not have. (342-343)

Delusional death penalty "opponents" do NOT really oppose capital punishment. Lester Jackson explains why opposition is impossible in EQUAL JUSTICE for VICTIMS. The real issue is NOT WHETHER the death penalty should exist BUT WHO should receive it: convicted murderers or innocent, decent law-abiding people. (9)

---

[Lester Jackson](#) is author of [numerous articles](#) about capital punishment, the Supreme Court, and American politics. His [recent book](#) is *Equal Justice for Victims: A Blueprint for the Rightful Restoration of Capital Punishment*. Reviews are [here](#), [here](#), [here](#). Copyright © 2019 by Lester Jackson, Ph.D. The above item originally appeared [here](#).