

7/9/05

Ideologue
by
Tom Holbrook

“Ideology... The body of ideas reflecting the social needs and aspirations of an individual, group, class or culture.”

“Ideologue... An advocate of a particular ideology, especially of its official exponents.”

Definitions of two words that have been thrown out and about a great deal over the last week, following the not so surprising resignation of Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor. For whatever reason the words are being spoken with a slight sneer or curling of the lip by those on the left, when they instruct our President that Justice O’Connor’s replacement should not be an ideologue. No way, you might say. Oh, indeed, WAY!

Let’s look at a comment by Senator Joseph Biden, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee and the top Democrat on the Judiciary Crime Committee... and, by the way, he’s running for President.

“The most important criteria a president should use in exercising his or her constitutional duty to appoint justices to the Supreme Court should be the independence and impartiality of the nominee.” I admired the way [Sandra Day O’Connor] approached her job: with open-mindedness, without ideological preconceptions. I would hope the president looks to these traits in selecting a nominee. When other factors, however, such as ideology, become pre-eminent in a president’s selection, the Senate itself must engage in stricter scrutiny and take a closer look at a nominee’s constitutional philosophy.”

Now if being an “ideologue” means you care deeply about something and your actions in life mirror those beliefs, then Sen. Biden and his compatriots are implying they would be happy if President Bush nominates a candidate for the Supreme Court who doesn’t believe in anything strongly enough to let it influence his or her vote. Am I off the mark here?

The President has stated time and again that he wants to nominate potential Justices who are strict believers in the United States Constitution and will work hard to see that their future votes on any subject must reflect the “*ideology*” of a Constitutional Court. Justice Sandra Day O’Connor was the swing voter on 75% of the cases heard by the Supreme Court that were decided by a 5-4 decision. What does that tell you? It tells me she was an activist Justice who votes according to how she feels on the subject and NOT interpreting what the Constitution says is right or wrong.

It is obvious in order to continue with their agenda of dumbing down America, the liberals cannot afford to have Justices who believe the Constitution is a fixed, ideological document that remains constant despite the societal demands to loosen moral and legal guidelines. For the moral good and continued safety

of our country we must insist that our Senators go along with the President in confirming his nominations to the Supreme Court.

Our country is at a critical crossroads and over the next few weeks I predict that regardless of whom President Bush nominates to the Supreme Court, the left will never give them an up and down vote for Senate Confirmation, unless the nominee is another O'Connor wannabe who is guided by his or her personal feelings rather than what is Constitutional. Prepare yourself to hear lies and attacks about his nominees and continued stonewalling on anyone who even breathes that he or she is a Christian, or believes in the sanctity of life. That will make them fall under the "*extreme circumstances*" rule the Democrats set out as its guideline for filibustering judicial appointees.

Everyone agrees that different Justices means a different Supreme Court. That means a chance to change this country for the better or to continue sliding down that slippery slope we got on a couple of decades ago. Let's pray that sane men will vote for a change for the better.

While were at it, aren't you tired of hearing anti-war rhetoric week in and week out. Talk about retro journalism... I get the feeling we've traveled back to the 60's with all the ridiculous talks about quagmires, and quasi-Viet Nam scenarios evolving. It's more than sad. Unfortunately, every American who dwells on such talk and reminisces about a war that was over thirty years ago, is opening old wounds that were long ago healed, and giving courage and added life to those terrorists who are doing their darndest in Iraq to get American citizens to demand that United States troops be brought home immediately.

Think about what you write or say in public. We all have the right to believe and speak what we think, but to do it in a public forum, so angrily and continually, increases the danger to our military personnel who are in harm's way. You who are so intent on ending the war in Iraq must know you are inadvertently lengthening the conflict, believe it or not. Think seriously about how you present your negativity... it's poison to some of those around you.

#