

Duquesne University

Duquesne Scholarship Collection

Hallowed Secularism

The Collective Works of Bruce Ledewitz, Adrian
Van Kaam C.S.Sp. Endowed Chair in Scholarly
Excellence and Professor of Law

3-30-2012

March 30, 2012: A Fundamental Rights Case Masquerading as a Commerce Clause Case

Bruce Ledewitz

Duquesne University, ledewitz@duq.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dsc.duq.edu/ledewitz-hallowedsecularism>



Part of the [Constitutional Law Commons](#), and the [Law and Philosophy Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Ledewitz, B. (2012). March 30, 2012: A Fundamental Rights Case Masquerading as a Commerce Clause Case. Retrieved from <https://dsc.duq.edu/ledewitz-hallowedsecularism/633>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Collective Works of Bruce Ledewitz, Adrian Van Kaam C.S.Sp. Endowed Chair in Scholarly Excellence and Professor of Law at Duquesne Scholarship Collection. It has been accepted for inclusion in Hallowed Secularism by an authorized administrator of Duquesne Scholarship Collection. For more information, please contact beharyr@duq.edu.

Title: A Fundamental Rights Case Masquerading as a Commerce Clause Case

Date: 2012-03-30T05:04:00.001-04:00

3/30/2012—The late Chief Justice Rehnquist explained the limits of the Commerce Clause on the power of Congress to regulate. When the matter is genuinely economic, the presumption should be that Congress can regulate. When Congress is doing something else, close connections to commerce in a traditional sense are more necessary. Under this approach, Obamacare is obviously constitutional. The concerns apparently animating Justice Kennedy about changing the relationship of citizen and government demonstrate that the issue is not the Commerce Clause or even federal power. For wouldn't the same issue be present if Massachusetts required each person to buy healthcare insurance? And wouldn't the same conservative, pro-market arguments be made? But of course, Massachusetts does require such a purchase now. As a fundamental right, this interference by government is justified by a simple reality. We all have health insurance already. Even the uninsured know that if they are in a traffic accident, the ambulance will come out and they will get emergency room treatment. They will not be left to bleed to death. That is what health insurance is, at least in great part. And it is why health insurance is not being forced to buy broccoli. The prospect of the Court striking down Obamacare depresses me. It means the Supreme Court will now be the reason Americans don't have universal healthcare, rather alone in the world. That is not the Court's job. It is not the Court's job to decide the fundamental social/economic system of the country. This decision will be made on the basis of an economic philosophy much of the country disagrees with—as Justice Holmes said once before in criticizing conservative justices. What is the point of teaching constitutional decisions as if they were law? I always said it was just politics and now it obviously is.