

Student's Name

Professor's Name

Course Number

Date Due



Introduction

Matt was a very important chief of the Ku Klux Klan. He was such a leader who believed on the whites' supremacy over the other races. This made him give a racist speech and even cautioned the government that there would be revenge in case the federal government limited the whites' supremacy. He was even arrested and charged in the court of law. It is in this regard that this paper will critically discuss whether Matt should have been arrested and charged. It would also discuss the amendments and protections that are involved in the case. Finally, the paper will make an argument by providing supporting evidence on whether the court made the correct decision.

From a personal point of view I think that Matt should have been arrested and charged. His racist speech was against the international laws of human rights that are against human racism based on culture, skin or tribe. He also threatened the government that stern actions would be taken by other people if the government restricted the whites' supremacy in their Klan. Additionally, he also broke the law that banned public support for violence and crime.



The protections and amendments involved in Matt case is the clause of equal protection. This is a protection that there is no state that can deny any person to have equal rights regardless of their race or ethnicity (Batten 435). This is a protection law that was violated by Matt since he discriminated people from other races when he gave a racist speech. The main amendment involved in the case was the Fourteenth Amendment which perpetuated and validated the equality acts which were outlined in the Civil Rights Acts. These laws assured everybody that they have equal rights similar to individuals from whites' supremacy. Nevertheless, Matt did not respect other people's rights and as a result, he discriminated due to their race.

In reference to the decision made by the court to fine Matt \$1,000 and jail him for 7 years, it was the right decision that the court made.

The court made the right decision in fining and jailing Matt due to the violation of the laws that governs the state. For instance, instead of respecting the rule of law, he violated the law that prohibited the citizens from supporting or getting involved in acts of violence or crime for political transformation. This is a law that prevented any type of group with similar concepts from gathering in public. However, Matt did not respect that law and went further to gather people in public. This violated the rules of the land and led to his arrest and eventual fine and jail for seven years. In addition, Matt also engaged in other activities which were against the law, for instance he discriminated people from other races and even warned the government that there would be revenge if the whites were restricted from their supremacy over other races. Therefore, it is not a good idea to discriminate each other based on their racial background since everybody has equal rights.

Conclusion

Human rights are the moral principles that define particular standards of human behaviors, and are normally safeguarded as legal rights in international and national law. Therefore, from the case of Matt, breaking the already established law for personal gains is not the best way to get justice (Batten 307). Matt could have avoided the fine and jail if he would have respected the law by not breaking the prohibited law of not gathering in public. Finally, in the modern world, racism is not the best way to resolve differences with people from other races. Matt should desist from racism and the rule of law will never lead him to jail.

Works Cited

Batten, Donna. *Gale encyclopedia of American law*. 3rd ed. Detroit, Mich.: Gale, 2011. Print.