

REPARATIONS?

(3/17/19)

by Bobby Fratta

Using presidential hopeful Julian Castro's own words of: "If under the Constitution we compensate people because we take their property, why wouldn't you compensate people who actually were property", 3 things make him look foolish and ignorant. Firstly, those "who actually were property" all died long ago. End of story. But secondly, we would not compensate people who "actually were property" because the Constitution does not state we can or should. End of story again. But thirdly, if we do follow the Constitution and compensate the people the government actually took "property" from, wouldn't that mean the slave owners are the ones who'd need to be compensated since their "property" was taken away from them without compensation? Plus many thousands were killed by the government when they fought to keep their "property". So for anyone who supports giving reparations to decendants, going by the Constitution - it's the decendants of the slave owners who'd need to be compensated. Does Castro support that? Or is he fully against the Constitution he'd have to take an oath to defend?