

Book review on saying what the law is

[Health & Medicine](#), [Body](#)



Saying What The Law Is explains in another perspective the nature of the constitution. This book creates an analytical view on the laws and the constitution of the United States. The author has a vast experience in writing and working on constitution issues. His experience as a lawyer has also contributed enough to the creation of the analytical group. Many analysts have argued that the book is created in form of a written activism. Its critical view on the constitution enables it to become one of the sort books by other activist. The book also criticizes the way in which the government implements the stipulated clauses of the law.

It highlights bits in which the government has not effectively implanted the constitution. Generally, the book dwells deeply on constitution implementation and how effectively it is done. In words by Stoner (2003) Fried's book can easily influence the mind of a reader to an activism point. It enables a reader to effectively ask and fight for their rights as stipulated by the constitution. After reading the book, the reader can be guided to a direction which is the most appropriate way. The reader acquires the mind of a law abiding citizen but with the thirst of being effectively represented in all quarters of the country. In words by Stoner (2003) the book can create a generation of rights activist if a whole generation is to be sensitized on the impact of the book. The author further argues that the depth at which the book dwells in to the government implementation strategies enables a reader to be more indulged in the political scene of the country.

The author sees the book as a political and human creation: A document with many gaps and loop holes that need to be answered if justice and equality is to be achieved in society. From this perspective the author views the

constitution as tool for change but this is only possible if there are proper implementation tools. The contrast and contradiction in the constitution creates a society and judiciary system that looks to influence its stipulations (Fried, 2004). The author also views the constitution as just court opinions that are used in the creation of doctrines. His main contradictions are raised from the way in which the creation and implementation of constitution clauses and doctrines. To drive his points to a conclusive understanding the author highlighted different cases to relating to the clauses that require scrutiny in the constitution. The author could easily fit in the bracket of political activists. However, the author does not express his views an activism form.

With the author have vast experience in law and the constitution; he knew which part of the document and the law that needs to be changed (Stoner, 2003). His position on these matters is based on the opinion of all people in need of constitutional justice (Fried, 2004). The relationship of the author and the constitution is strong enough to create proper assumptions and theories that are in line with the laws of the land. Generally, the author views the constitution as any other document created by man and hence it requires change and perfection. From the book he is quick to note that the judiciary is the body with the best opportunity and chance to effectively and appropriately implement change to the constitution (Stoner, 2003).

After reading the book, my general perspective and views were changed in another direction. My view on the Supreme Court was based on transparency and a body of change and truth. From the book the body is not perfect; the body needs change in order to allow for a proper implementation of the

constitution requirements. In general my perspective on the courts did not include the issue on transparency (Fried, 2004). I viewed the courts as perfect branches of the law that ensured the constitution is implemented accordingly. The courts in the book do not have the required credibility to handle constitutional changes without a transparent body to officiate the process. The interpretation of the constitution should be based on the interpretation of the judiciary. This is contrary to the general assumption of the public. Every person is entitled a view and an opinion to believe in. However, what counts is the interpretation of the judiciary on the document (Fried, 2004). But this does not give right for the body to be enemies of the constitution.

The society should act as watchdogs to the judiciary when implementing the laws of the country. From the text my view on this matter was not influenced much but I was more enlightened on my duty as a citizen with the right of being represented by the law. My perspective on the function of the American government was based on performance in implementing various national policies. After reading the text, the functions of this executive body should also be based on how effectively the constitution is implemented. This incorporates how well the judiciary system is created and its divisibility of duties and power.

References

Fried, C. (2004). *Saying what the law is: the constitution in the Supreme Court*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Stoner, J. (2003). *Common-Law Liberty: Rethinking American Constitutionalism*. KS: University Press of Kansas