

LIBERTY PARK INN®

A Syndicated Column

Name: **Chief Justice John Roberts**

By: David Henry © 2012

“Why did Chief Justice John Roberts do it,” I wondered? “Some conservatives are calling him a traitor.”

Julie replied, “David, I think the more intriguing questions might not be ‘why’ he did it, but ‘who’ and ‘how?’”

Julie is a staunch conservative and a political activist in her early 30’s. She is smart and determined and has a high energy level. She also volunteers part time as a lobbyist.

I was curious to know what she meant by her statement, so I asked, “What do you mean, Julie?”

“I mean, ‘Who got to him?’ and ‘How did they do it?’ Here, let me explain.”

“Ok,” I replied. “Go ahead.”

“I’ve been thinking about this and looking for a rational explanation for this surprise ruling ever since it came out. And I have come to a conclusion.

“Either Roberts was never really a conservative at all or someone did something to make him change his vote.”

“That’s an interesting conclusion,” I replied.

Julie continued, “If Roberts was just pretending to be a conservative, then we can reasonably assume that he was watching for an opportunity when he could use his position to do something that would betray and devastate the conservative movement.”

“That makes sense,” I replied. “But do you think he had any idea how much opposition there would be to his decision?”

Julie responded without hesitation. “Roberts went to Harvard! Certainly he’s smart enough to know that his flip flop on this issue would raise the ire of conservatives. So there must have been some strong motivation for him to change his vote.

“In the majority opinion he wrote, ‘It is reasonable to construe what Congress has done as increasing taxes...’”

“I don’t think that’s reasonable,” I commented.

“Neither do I,” Julie responded. When Congress passed this legislation, they called it a ‘penalty’ and since the ruling came out, the White House has also called it a ‘penalty.’ I see no justification to change what Congress clearly said. To me this is just plain dishonest. So I wonder what caused Roberts to make this dishonest statement.”

“Do you have any theories,” I asked?

“Well, David, I don’t think he accepted a bribe. He just doesn’t strike me as being that kind of person. Besides he already has everything that he needs financially. So I just don’t see enough motivation for him to take a bribe.”

“So what do you think it might be,” I asked?

“Perhaps,” Julie answered, “Roberts or a loved one was threatened in some way. We’ve all seen movies where someone was forced to do something he believed was wrong.”

“Do you really think that might have happened here,” I asked?

“Yes, David,” Julie responded with a certainty that left no doubt. “I think that’s a very real possibility; perhaps even the threat of bodily harm or death. For most people the threat of death would be sufficient motivation to change their vote. But it might also be possible that someone threatened to reveal some incriminating information about him or a loved one.”

“Why would anyone threaten a Supreme Court Justice,” I asked?

“I can think of several possibilities,” Julie responded. “One would be money.

“There are many billions of dollars involved in the implementation of this legislation. Whenever there is a lot of money involved, there will almost always be a power struggle to see who’s going to control that money. It’s not uncommon for people to kill to get what they want.

“Even a petty thief will rob a local convenience store and only get a few hundred dollars but he will kill the clerk in the process. Would it be

difficult to believe that when billions of dollars are up for grabs that there are people who might be willing to kill to get their hands on that money?

“But,” Julie continued, “this could also be political. This is a presidential election year. And this ruling can only strengthen the president’s position in the upcoming election. This ruling proves that our president has the power to get his agenda accomplished, even when there is strong opposition.”

“Are you suggesting that there could be White House involvement?” I asked with some disbelief.

“Sure there could be. Look at the Watergate Scandal that rocked the White House during the presidency of Richard Nixon. He steadfastly denied any knowledge of the Watergate break-in until the White House tapes became public knowledge and we heard the president’s own words discussing the break-in.

“We know that people use force and other devious and illegal methods to gain political power.”

“But we cannot accuse a sitting president without evidence,” I argued.

“No. Of course not,” Julie responded. “We can’t assume that the current president has any involvement in this matter. There are plenty of other people who would have as much or even more motivation to force Roberts to switch his vote.

“We can only speculate at this time. The one thing we can be sure of is either John Roberts was never actually the conservative we thought he was or something happened to force him to change his vote.”

LPI-37 (851)

Notes: Original publication date: 7/9/12

Other commentators this week appeared to not notice or care to ask the question ‘Why?’ This column suggests some possible reasons why Roberts made the decision that he did.

Liberty Park Inn® is a syndicated column about issues and current events featuring conversations in an imaginary hotel. You may contact the author through his website at www.libertyparkinn.com.