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abortion, eternal, and immobile.
The writers of the Constitution knew, however, that they were merely human and that what they perceived as Good may in fact not be. To remedy this, they specifically made provisions so that the Constitution could be amended.

Amending the Constitution is not an easy process, and it was not meant to be. This document was not supposed to be changed from generation to generation. Change was only warranted as a means to redress grievances which future generations might have with the framers.

Yet, somehow we have lost touch with how our government is supposed to work. The Constitution is the legislative body of our government, but it has become flawed and inefficient. Instead of dealing with important controversial issues of our times, they have relinquished their powers to the Supreme Court.

The Constitution of the Court, in turn, have been manipulating and distorting the "Constitution in order to extend their influence to all facets of American life. The writers of the Constitution did not write the document in some kind of recondite code which could only be deciphered at a later date by the most arcane scholars. They spelled out exactly the rights which they felt were necessary for a free democracy in simple and everyday language.
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All Americans want - an inde-

pendent judiciary as proposed by the framers of the Constitution. That means a Supreme Court that will enforce the Constitution as written - that will refuse to amend the Constitution by the arbitrary exercise of judicial power - amendment by judicial say-

so." [Fireside Chat, 9 March 1937]

Now, we have a man nomi-
nated for the Supreme Court who believes that the framers of the Constitution knew exactly what they were doing, that the Constitution is literal and exact, understandable even for the common man. He believes that the Constitution does not live through labyrinthine reinterpretations by Supreme Court Justices but lives instead in the same way as the universal truths and rights espoused therein endure from generation to generation.

The reason that so many special interest groups fear Bork is that they realize that they have usurped "rights" from the Constitu-
tion. Through capricious rul-
ings, both beneficial and sinister, the Court has given pseudo-rights whose only basis is a contrived reading of the Constitution. Rights obtained in this manner are hollows of democracy, in constant fear of being discovered.

Stevens v. Connecticut and Roe v. Wade are the modern day equivalents of Plessy v. Ferguson or Korematsu v. United States. If citizens are concerned about the rights of women, then they should work to pass the ERA. If they are concerned about some universal right to privacy, then a privacy amendment should be drafted. The Court has neither the responsibility nor the right to grant what is not given.

Bork should not only be a jus-
tice of the Supreme Court, he

should be Chief Justice. This
clear thinking advocate of judici-

tal restraint is exactly what we

need to take us into the 21st cen-
tury. Conservatives do not spe-
cially lose with the loss of Bork; a conservative judge will be appointed.

Instead, all Americans lose with Bork's defeat. We are allow-
ing the most qualified man for

the bench slip away because of
dubious political motives and
distrust of the Court. Dissention

is not what is wrong with Amer-

ica - hypocrisy is.
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