

## MACHIAVELLIAN CONSERVATIVE?

Chief Justice Roberts assaulted law and common sense, twice, to save Obamacare. First, he declared the mandate a tax—but “all Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives”; Obamacare originated in Harry Reid’s office. Second, he justified subsidies for all Americans, despite Obamacare’s plain words “established by the state”. The conventional wisdom is that such specious legal reasoning, not seen since *Roe v Wade*, protected the Supreme Court from the opprobrium and civil unrest that proper legal reasoning would have engendered.

Rebuttal (submitted for “a conversation”): the Chief is a subtle, indeed truly Machiavellian, Conservative! Evidence: allowing Obamacare to function exposes its lies, evasions, delays and incompetencies. Had the mandate being disallowed and the subsidies denied, Americans would not know first hand how truly awful government run healthcare is. As with Hillarycare, Liberals would continue to insist that government healthcare really could work, if only given the chance.

So my conversation starter is questions: is the Chief’s Humpty Dumpty lookingglass act (“a word . . . means just what I choose it to mean”) no more than his subtle way of exposing Obamacare warts and all? Had he not committed those assaults, would we have experienced the horrors of “if you like your doctor you can keep him”; increased premiums, copays and deductibles; seasoned physicians leaving the practice and aspiring ones eschewing medical school debt; Medicare costs exploding; and on and on ad infinitum?

Could it be that, by outing Obamacare as the FUBAR it is, Chief Justice Roberts is after all a true conservative?

\*Sent to Letters to Editor Wall Street Journal – 07/02/2015

