

Why is packing the court a bad idea? The topic of court packing has been a highly debated issue. In this ongoing debate, it is apparent that the opponents' argument is much stronger than the proponents' argument because they prove that packing the court weakens Americans; it also increases political interference and is unconstitutional.

Firstly, the opponents' argument is stronger than the proponents' argument because they prove that packing the court weakens Americans. For example, the opponents claim that "Michael H. McGinley, JD, lawyer and former Supreme Court law clerk for Justice Alito, argued that packing the court would threaten the "rule of law and judicial independence." (1) This shows that changing the government's foundation will undermine the judicial independence established by the Founding Fathers.

Secondly, the opponents have a stronger argument in favor of unpacking the court than their proponents because they claim that it increases political interference. For instance, the opponents **argue claim** that "Even Vice President Joe Biden, 2020 Democratic presidential nominee, is wary of court packing, stating in 2019, "No, I'm not prepared to go on and try to pack the court, because we'll live to rue that day." (1) This indicates that adding more justices will consequently lose any validity the court has whatsoever.

On the contrary, the proponents believe that the Supreme Court should add more justices. They claim that "Ultimately, the number of Supreme Court justices is arbitrary, easily revised by Congress, and ripe for change. Court packing could signal a new era of non-partisanship in the Supreme Court." (2) However, the opponents have a stronger argument than their proponents because they argue that "Changing the number of justices has been linked to political conniving, whether the 1866 shrinkage to prevent Johnson appointments or the 1801 removal of one seat by President John Adams to prevent incoming President Thomas Jefferson from filling a seat or the 1937 attempt by Roosevelt to get the New Deal past the court." (2)

\* I STOPPED TYPING HERE. 60 MINS.

(This sentence is my explanation for the Rebuttal above). This indicates that attempts made by former presidents to change the Constitution have been unsuccessful in the past.

In summary, the opponents' argument to unpack the court is better supported than the proponents' argument. The opponents prove that adding more justices to the Supreme Court is unconstitutional. In addition, filing the court with justices changes the makeup of the court and it undermines the rule of law. The U.S. structure executed laws and they should remain that way.

**Commented [1]:** This quote is lengthy. Also, I am not seeing how it rebuts your counterargument or aligns with your third main idea.

**Commented [2]:** The focus is 45 mins.

**Commented [3]:** Your explanation does not clarify how your evidence link to your third main idea.

**Commented [4]:** Rewrite this statement. You should be coming from the opponents' point of view, which is the side that you are supporting. (I suggest revisiting your previous essays for guidance). Remember, I stated previously that you should not start your sentences with words ending in "ing" i.e. filing... "...You risk writing a sentence fragment or a dangling modifier." Lastly, your conclusion should restate your main ideas and summarize your essay.