I believe the writers of the constitution did not intend for it to be read only at face value.  The introduction states "We the people, in order to form a more perfect union" indicates to me that they did not think this document was the end-all and be-all of ruling the United States.  They did not say this document would form the perfect union, just one that was more perfect, and this document would help lead them in that direction.  A reading of the Constitution indicates to the reader that it is not stagnant, so I think the textualist position is a short-sighted one.  
  
One of the biggest indicators that the Constitution is not intended to be read just at face value, was the establishment of the Supreme Court under Article III.   The Supreme Court is granted power to make decisions on all disputes which arise, that may fall under Constitutional jurisdiction, or fall outside the jurisdiction of state laws.  The judges are in essence expected to interpret the Constitution based on experience and legal history, to apply it in such a way that the rights of citizens are protected, including the unenumerated rights.   This definitely indicates the need for the Constitution to be applied in the spirit of the document, and not just what is written.  We can look again to the introduction of the Constitution, where it says the document is ordained to "establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity", in order to understand what that spirit is.  
  
Professor Amar talks in week eight, about the 9th Amendment, which further emphasizes the Constitution should be applied in spirit. He talks briefly about some things we as citizens are able to do in our daily lives (wear a hat, own a dog), that are not specifically granted under the Constitution.  More importantly, the 9th Amendment indicates that if certain rights were given to a people, they can not be granted at the expense of other peoples.  This is a very important distinction, because it says "peoples" and not just "citizens". Up until certain events in our history, some groups of people could not get citizenship or take advantage of the rights granted to citizens.  
  
One of the other reasons the Constitution can not be taken completely textually, is that it doesn't, in writing, prepare for every possible legal situation.  One of the major examples presented in the lecture is what happens if the vice president is impeached.  According to the Constitution, the vice president presides over all impeachment proceedings, because he presides over Congress.  However, given legal history and basic common sense, you couldn't have somebody preside over their own trial.  The spirit of the Constitution includes "establish Justice", and that would certainly not be just.  Other legal examples include situations where we must extrapolate from what is written.  The 5th Amendment protects somebody from double jeopardy, and thus also protects them from being tried three or more times for the same crime, as well.  
  
These are just a few specific examples indicating that the Constitution is not just the text, but there are many more!  The Constitution was written to establish a government that could protect the way of life our founders envisioned.  It allows for that government to do things which are necessary for the protection of its citizens and their rights, but also seeks to protect the citizens from their government; this requires flexibility.  Most importantly, the Constitution allows itself to be amended, so even if you are a textualist, the text changes!