

One Stone, Two Powers: How Chief Justice Roberts Saved America

Author unknown

“So David triumphed over the Philistine with a sling and a stone; without a sword in his hand, he struck down the Philistine and killed him.” – 1 Samuel 17:50

Many people are very angry at Chief Justice John Roberts for his ruling that **Obamacare is Constitutional as a tax**. They are outraged at what they see as his validation of [the complete](#) usurpation of Constitutional protections, and terrified that America has been effectively destroyed. Some of them are even talking “revolution,” and asking each other in person, and in [print](#), “what are you prepared to do”?

Well this analysis of the Roberts ruling asks the same thing, but in a different context. What *are* you prepared to do? Are you, for example, prepared to read? Are you prepared to learn? Are you prepared to entertain the concept that you might be wrong about Roberts – about what he actually ruled, about what he actually meant, about what he actually did, and why the rest of the Court would not stand with him?

If you aren't, then don't bother reading any further. Beware: this analysis pops bubbles - *hard*. Here's a taste of what I mean:

You know all the yowling and screaming about how Roberts changed a penalty into a tax? In his ruling, **Roberts quoted Obamacare itself**, at Title 26, § 5000A (g) (1), which reads: *The penalty provided by this section ... shall be assessed and collected in the same manner as an assessable penalty under subchapter B of chapter 68.*

Then Roberts did this [amazing](#), totally judicial thing that no one else can do except someone with his vast power at their fingertips – he actually looked up the law that Obamacare quoted. And he found that subchapter B of chapter 68, specifically at § 6671 (a), says: *The penalties and liabilities provided by this subchapter shall be ... assessed and collected in the same manner as taxes. ...any reference in this title to “tax” imposed by this title shall be deemed also to refer to the penalties and liabilities provided by this subchapter.*

After reading the actual laws cited by Obamacare itself, Roberts made this blockbuster observation: *“The requirement to pay is found in the Internal Revenue Code and enforced by the IRS, which-as we previously explained-must assess and [collect](#) it “in the same manner as taxes.”*

Let's see, Roberts said the penalty must be assessed and collected “in the same manner as taxes” after reading that Obamacare itself invokes § 6671 (a) – which literally and specifically states the penalty must be assessed and collected “in the same manner as taxes.”
Wow, that's a radical ruling?

What exactly is § 6671 (a)? It's part of the Internal Revenue Code *that was there before Obamacare was even created!* All Obamacare did was point to it, and say “use that.”

So why weren't Americans enraged about how § 6671 (a) equates the treatment of penalties as taxes *before* Obamacare?

How the hell can anyone say Roberts was “legislating from the bench” when he simply repeated back *pre-existing* tax law that *Obamacare referenced for itself*? The answer to that question is simple – **no one actually looked up the laws** before they decided their country had been “destroyed.” Yet they're ready to fight a “revolution” over it! A revolution for *what* - to make new laws that they *still* won't read?

If you want to get angry, get angry about how the other eight Justices *didn't* point out this simple fact about **penalties already being treated as taxes**. After all, that's what judges are supposed to *do* - right? Point out what the law *is*, *rather than what anyone wants* it to be? And isn't that *exactly* what the Chief Justice did? Maybe that's why he's Chief Justice – **he gets to read the actual laws**. Maybe all the other Justices have to listen to the media to find out how they should rule.

Be warned: this analysis is not for the squeamish, but if you really want to learn *what* Roberts did, and *why* he did it, and *what* the Obamacare tax laws *actually mean* (as opposed to what you *thought* they meant), [read on](#).

And you can start by understanding this:

- Chief Justice Roberts limited the Constitutionality of Obamacare to **ONLY those statutorily-defined “persons” upon whom the income tax is imposed**.
- **95% of the American population are NOT those statutorily-defined “persons.”**
- **Obamacare does NOT apply to 95% of the American population**.

Don't believe me? Then like I said, *read on*.

Point #1: Imposed Means Enforced – [Part 1](#)

Taxes, whether “voluntary” or not, are subject to enforcement. If a tax can't be enforced, it's not a tax. That's why the income tax law, Title 26, [Chapter 1](#), Section 1, starts out with: “*There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual...*” the Obamacare law, Title 26, § 5000A, (b) (1) starts out with: “*...there is hereby imposed on the taxpayer who is an applicable individual a penalty...*” Notice the mutual use of the word “imposed”? It means *enforced* by the government.

Point #2: Obamacare is Part of the Income Tax Laws

Obamacare, at Title 26, § 5000A, (b) (2) states: “*Any penalty imposed by this section ... shall be [included with a taxpayer's return under chapter 1](#)...*” Chapter 1 of Title 26 (the Internal Revenue Code) is where the income tax is imposed. **Title 26 is also where Obamacare is found**. So when Obamacare penalties (which enable it to be imposed and therefore enforced) are specified within Obamacare itself to be *part* of the income tax return, they are *also* thereby making those penalties subject to the income tax enforcement laws of Title 26.

Point #3: Obamacare is Written to Deceive

In his ruling, Roberts observed that Obamacare specified that its penalty “*shall be assessed and collected in the same manner as an assessable penalty under subchapter B of chapter 68,*” which in turn specifies that those penalties “*shall be assessed and collected in the same manner as taxes.*” Then he notes that the authority for those acts are found in “§6201 (*assessment authority*); §6301 (*collection authority*),” which are the same authorities used for assessing and collecting income taxes.

Then Roberts says something very curious. He says: “*That interpretation is consistent with the remainder of §5000A(g), which instructs the Secretary on **the tools he may use to collect the penalty.** See §5000A(g)(2)(A) (**barring criminal prosecutions**); §5000A(g)(2)(B) (**prohibiting the Secretary from using notices of lien and levies**).*”

Roberts is actually pointing out what “*tools that may be used to collect the penalty*”. If you look at his parenthetical descriptions, they’re **denials** of the tools necessary to collect the penalty. The first refers to “*barring criminal prosecutions,*” and the second refers to “*prohibiting the Secretary from using notices of lien and levies.*” So how are they “*tools that may be used to collect the penalty*”? Just how is the Obamacare tax penalty going to be collected, if both criminal prosecutions and liens and levies cannot be used to go get it?

Roberts is drawing our attention to these statutes. Let’s look at them.

Title 26, § 5000A (g) (2) says:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law-

(A) In the case of any failure by a taxpayer to timely pay any penalty imposed by this section, such taxpayer **shall not be subject to any criminal prosecution or penalty** with respect to such failure.

(B) The Secretary shall **not** (i) file notice of lien with respect to any property of a taxpayer by reason of any failure to pay the penalty imposed by this section, or (ii) levy on any such property with respect to such failure.

Section (A) has to do with “barring criminal prosecutions.” Sounds nice – but what does it apply to? A failure to “timely pay” a penalty.

Guess what? Failure to timely pay a penalty is **NOT** a criminal act. Usually, it invokes further penalties and interest. Only if you fail to pay altogether could the situation reach criminal status, and even then, it would have to be willful. Otherwise, the penalties and interest would just continue to pile up. “Willful failure to pay” is “*not*” failure to timely pay.” So since the **ONLY** criminal charge that § 5000A (g) (2) (A) protects a taxpayer from doesn’t exist, **the entire statute is a fraud**. It’s meant to make people think Obamacare is harmless, and that deliberately putting off paying its penalty won’t make anyone subject to criminal charges. But this *isn’t* true.

How about Section (B)? Well, **a levy is a seizure of property**. For that to happen, a *lien* has to be filed first, specifying what property is to be seized, and that due process has been followed. After the lien has been filed, but before the levy is made upon the property, a *notice of lien* is sent to the taxpayer who owns the property the government intends to seize through levy, to let them know that the lien has been filed against them.

Now what does (B)(i) say? **That a “notice of lien” shall not be filed.** Well, **notices of lien aren’t filed**, except as copies of the mailing that was made to the taxpayer. ***Liens are filed - that’s*** the functional act. Not “notices of lien.” **Filing a “notice of lien” is NOT the same thing as filing a “lien,” because it does NOT legally enable a levy.** It’s literally just a “notice” that a “lien” has been filed. And it’s supposed to be *mailed*, not “filed.” So when (B)(i) forbids it to be filed, well good – because it’s not supposed to be anyway! Yet this was obviously written to make you to *think* it’s talking about actual liens, when it says “notices of lien” – when it’s not.

How about (B)(ii), where it is specified that **no “levy on any such property”** shall be made. Well, *what* “such” property? None other than the property in (B)(i) of course, that was specified in the “notice of lien.” But wait a second – you can’t legally levy property from just a “notice of lien” *anyway!* You need a *real* lien to levy property! So this section, once again, is saying that something *illegal* will not be done by the government – specifically, **that no property will seized with just a “notice of lien” to back up the levy.**

What did Roberts draw our attention to, when he specified laws in Obamacare that he said are tools to *collect* the penalty, when they seemed to be tools to *prevent* the collection of the penalty?

He did nothing less than indicate that these prevention tools are no such thing – that they block nothing, and that the only actual tools that are indicated *enable* the *full* collection powers of Title 26 tax laws to be used (i.e., it’s a *fully functional* Death Star). And not just those directed by “*subchapter B of chapter 68,*” but *also* criminal penalties, *and* lien and levy powers. Even worse, both of these were cited by Obamacare not *only* to mislead the public, **but also to establish a judicially noticeable reference to legitimize their usage against the public.**

Roberts deliberately drew attention to this. And in doing so, he effectively said, “**watch out – read this carefully**; this ruling is dealing with a law that was **written to deceive**. You have to be very careful in reading it *and* my ruling if you want to understand what everything means.” Then, concerning enforcement, he showed that *nothing in Obamacare blocks the usage of Subchapter B of Chapter 68, Criminal, or Lien & Levy powers against taxpayers to collect Obamacare penalties.* And most importantly, *Obamacare is written to deceive.*

Point #4: “Person” has Different Legal Definitions for Different Purposes

Well, when Chief Justice Roberts referenced Obamacare’s use of “*subchapter B of chapter 68,*” he cited a statute from within that subchapter to support his interpretation of its usage – specifically, he cited §6671(a). If you look up §6671(a), you’ll find that it does, indeed, support Robert’s interpretation. You also find, underneath it, §6671(b) – **right where the Chief Justice wanted you to find it.**

Title 26, Chapter 68, Subchapter B, § 6671 (b) states:

- The term “**person**”, as used in this subchapter, includes an officer or employee of a corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership, who as such officer, employee, or member is **under a duty to perform** the act in respect of which the violation occurs.

That’s a *very* important definition of “person.” But before we get into that subject – remember the other two enforcement tools that were supposedly banned from use, but actually were not,

discussed above in Point #3? The first was criminal enforcement. The second was lien and levy powers.

Criminal enforcement is found in Chapter 75 of Title 26. **The definition of “person” for the purposes of criminal enforcement is found in that chapter.** Specifically, it is found in Title 26, Chapter 75, § 7343, which reads:

- *The term “**person**” as used in this chapter includes an officer or employee of a corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership, who as such officer, employee, or member is under a duty to perform the act in respect of which the violation occurs.*

Finally, lien and levy powers are found in the chapters 63 and 64 **specified by Chief Justice Roberts in his ruling**, where he references them as the “*assessment § 6201 (a)*” and “*collection § 6301*” chapters, respectively. Liens are only useful to enable levies, so definitions for levy powers also reference lien powers. In the levy chapter (64), at § 6332 (f), we find the following definition of “person”:

- *The term “**person**,” as used in subsection (a), includes an officer or employee of a corporation or a member or employee of a partnership, who as such officer, employee, or member is under a duty to surrender the property or rights to property, or to discharge the obligation.*

Take a moment to compare the three definitions of “person” cited from Robert’s ruling listed above, that are **found in three different enforcement sections** of Title 26. They are *identical*.

Yet, if you look up the *general* Title 26 definition of “**person**” in § 7701 (a) (1), you’ll find: “*The term “**person**” shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.*” Generally speaking, in the entirety of Title 26, **the term “person” also means the term ‘individual.’** That’s why when the income tax laws and Obamacare laws address ‘individuals’ and ‘persons,’ they have identical meanings.

Compare the general definition of “person” in § 7701 (a) (1) above that says it’s “*an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.*” That’s it – no fine print. But the definition of “person” **for enforcement purposes** in the above cited §§ 6671 (b), 7343 and 6332 (f) are **way, way, way more narrow.** **To be that ‘person’** you have to be:

1) *An officer or employee of a listed type of corporation;* AND 2) *Under a duty to perform an act;* AND 3) *In respect of said act, a violation occurs.* That’s a *lot* more specific than just being an “*individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.*”

What does this difference in definitions of the term “person” mean? It means that the definition of “**person**” the government can punish for tax violations, is **NOT the same** definition of “person” that is used in the *rest* of Title 26. More specifically, it means that the ***only* “persons”** the government can impose tax violation *enforcements* against, are **officers or employees of a corporation, who have a duty to act in some way regarding tax laws on behalf of their corporation, and who violate those tax laws on behalf of the corporation they officially represent.** Do you represent a corporation in an official capacity on behalf of that corporation’s tax obligations? If not, then you are ***not*** a §§ 6671 (b), 7343 and 6332 (f) “person” who can be liable for violating the tax enforcement laws.

And by direct reference through Obamacare itself, the enforcement laws the government would use to go after “persons” it claims are violating Obamacare taxes OR penalties OR fines are *also* found in §§ 6671 (b), 7343 and 6332 (f).

If you are *not* that definition of “person,” (which is repeated three different times in Title 26 to make absolutely clear *exactly* who it is talking about), then **you are NOT liable** for any other taxes which make use of the enforcement provisions linked to that definition, including income tax OR Obamacare.

Chief Justice Roberts **deliberately cited a law** which, if you actually look it up, is right next to the enforcement definition of “person” for Chapter 68, Subchapter B, and he *also indicated* that further enforcement definitions should be sought for the *fully applicable* criminal, and lien and levy, chapters of Title 26 – all of which turned out to be identical enforcement definitions for the term “person.” That extraordinary sequence of events is no accident – **it is a communication.**

Point #5: Taxpayers are Individuals are Persons

If the definition of “person” is so important, why do both the income tax laws and Obamacare laws refer to *individuals*? To confuse you, of course! And they both refer to *taxpayers*.

Think of it this way – persons or individuals *may* be subject to the enforcement of a particular tax, depending on a lot of things. *Taxpayers*, however, are persons or individuals **who are subject** to the enforcement of a particular tax. That’s why Title 26, § 7701 (a) states: ***“taxpayer” means any person subject to any internal revenue tax.***

Individuals *and* persons *may* be subject to the tax, depending on *what* definitions of those terms apply to them. **IF they are liable**, they are referred to as “**taxpayers**.” That’s why the income tax statutes *and* Obamacare statutes make so much use of the term “taxpayers.” When they talk about someone who *might* be subject to the tax, they use “**person**” or “**individual**,” but when they talk about someone who **absolutely is subject to the tax**, they use “**taxpayer**.”

Point #6: Imposed Means Enforced – Part 2

Both the income tax, and Obamacare, start out saying “a tax is imposed.” Not “a tax is made,” or a “tax exists,” or just “a tax.” **Imposed means enforced:** If it can’t be *enforced*, it can’t be *imposed*. If it can’t be enforced against *your definition of “person,”* it can’t be *imposed* on you. Even (and especially), if you fit the *general* definition of “person” or “individual,” but *not* within the *enforcement* definition of “person.” And if it can’t be *imposed* on you, you can’t be a *taxpayer*. **If you’re not a taxpayer...it doesn’t apply to you.**

Point #7: News Flash – The Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court Knows All This. Specifically, Roberts wrote: ***“The Federal Government does not have the power to order people to buy health insurance. Section 5000A would therefore be unconstitutional if read as a command. The Federal Government does have the power to impose a tax on those without health insurance. Section 5000A is therefore constitutional, because it can reasonably be read as a tax.”*** Did you catch that? This is the paragraph that drives everyone crazy. This is the paragraph that makes everyone scream that Roberts is crazy, but apply what has been explained above, to what Roberts wrote. He talked about what **“The Federal Government” has “the power” to do.**

He says: “*the power to order people to buy*” and then he says: “*the power to impose a tax on those*” He’s differentiating! “**People**” are not the same as “**those!**”

Order people? - the government does NOT have the power to “order” a **free people**.

Impose tax on those - the government DOES have the power to “impose” on “those,” because:

“**THOSE**” are **TAXPAYERS!** *Taxpayers* are – literally by *triple* definition - **imposed**

persons subject to enforcement via the detailed descriptions provided in §§ 6671 (b), 7343 and 6332 (f) of Title 26, specifically: 1) *An officer or employee of a listed type of corporation;* AND 2) *Under a duty to perform an act;* AND 3) *In respect of said act, a violation occurs.* Regarding “those ‘persons,” – **ONLY on “those persons,”** – Chief Justice Roberts ruled that Obamacare IS Constitutional.

He also specifically ruled that against the *people* (as in We The People), Obamacare is **NOT** constitutional. **Roberts specifically protected the constitutional freedom of the American People, right in front of their eyes, according to the actual meaning of the actual tax laws...** *...after ruling against any other constitutional clause that could serve to confuse the tax issues.* And THAT is why no other Justice would support him - *Because in Doing So, He Isolated and Exposed The Secret of LIMITED Tax Liability!*

Point #8: The Two Powers

If you’ve come this far, and didn’t know this material beforehand, you might be in shock at this point. Basically, the reason that Obamacare doesn’t apply to 95% of Americans is because it can **only be enforced against people responsible for running corporations** – not normal people simply working and living on their own behalf. And more, those limitations on the enforcement laws don’t come out of Obamacare. Rather, they’re part of the income tax laws that have been there all along, that Obamacare has attached itself to, in order to make use of them.

Can this really be possible? It means there are two separate enforcement powers held by the Federal government – one for corporation “**persons,**” and one for non-corporate, regular people. A giant scam has taken place by the government using legally defined terms such as “person,” and “individual,” and “taxpayer,” in order to confuse these identities, and especially to hide the two different powers of government.

Let’s look at Chief Justice Roberts again. In his ruling, Roberts wrote:

“This case concerns two powers that the Constitution does grant the Federal Government, but which must be read carefully to avoid creating a general federal authority akin to the police power.”

Now that’s a hell of a thing to say, isn’t it? “***This case concerns two powers.***” Ask yourself - *what* two powers?

The country has been ripping itself to shreds over Robert’s ruling because it’s only taking into account a **single power** – that of the Federal government? You might say, there’s the powers of the Commerce Clause, and the Necessary and Proper Clause that Roberts threw out when he kept the taxing power in, but that’s three powers, not two. So what’s the difference between them? How do you turn three powers into two? Why are there multiple powers in the first place?

Don't we have only one government? **No, we don't.** We have two "governments," in fact. **Two completely separate "governments," under one Constitution.**

The first "government" is the original one that deals with human beings acting only as human beings. That government only has the limited power derived from those human beings. Human beings are acknowledged as possessing **God-given natural rights** that existed before the people created a "government"; and which cannot be removed by that "government" because it simply does not have the authority to do so.

The second "government," is exactly the opposite of the first. The second "government" **creates, controls and runs corporations.** The very word "incorporate" means "give body to," or "bring into existence." Because that "government" creates corporations, it *owns* those corporations completely - **it is their creator.**

Corporations are legally **slaves to the "government" that created them.** They are created, live in obedience to, and die at the command of that "government" – and that **includes paying taxes to that "government."** The rules that that "government" can make for those corporations are literally *unlimited*, because those corporations **have no rights.** They only have *privileges* that are granted to them by their creator "government," privileges which can be changed or terminated at any time, solely at the pleasure of that "government."

Functionally, these two "governments" comprise *Federal jurisdictional powers* of our one *constitutional Republic.* They are the "two powers" to which Roberts refers, and he acknowledges them *both as constitutionally legitimate.*

He also warns however, that it is **extremely dangerous to mix them up.** He points out that if you mix them up, you can end up with what he calls "*a general federal authority akin to the police power.*" That's *exactly* what everyone is afraid Roberts *did* with his ruling, yet he specifically warned everyone *against* making that interpretation, and **he warned that the way to avoid that terrible mistake is to "read carefully."**

That's what this analysis is – a very, very careful reading. It is not *my* interpretation. It is a careful reading of what *Roberts actually said,* per his specific instructions. **Two governmental powers exist.** Roberts said so, and he warned against confusing them. The Chief Justice said that if we mix them up, **WE will create – by our very ignorance - "a general federal authority akin to the police power."**

That means people may be enabling the Federal government, through Obamacare, to start treating "We The People" with inalienable human rights, like wholly-owned government-privileged corporations, for everything.

Point #9: Bait and Switch and Presumption

What about forcing everyone to pay income tax *already*? If Obamacare doesn't apply to 95% of Americans because it is imposed by corporate income tax enforcement laws, then *how the hell* does the government get away with applying those *same* corporate income tax enforcement laws to *non-corporate, regular People*? Answer: **You volunteer to be treated as a corporation!**

Remember Roberts said that “without a careful reading” you can create “a general federal authority akin to the police power” concerning Obamacare? Concerning the income tax, **most Americans have NOT made a “careful reading” of the tax laws**, and therefore they **HAVE** “created a *specific* federal authority akin to the police power” concerning income taxes.

You see, as free human beings, **we have the right to make *contracts***. And there is such a thing as a *presumed contract*. The government is not responsible for people’s **legal ignorance**, and that **if they volunteer to be treated as a corporation, then the government gets to treat them like a corporation**. Courts have agreed that neither they, nor any government official has to *tell you* you’re being treated as a corporation, since you *volunteered* in the first place.

95% of Americans *don’t* have to pay income tax, because it’s enforcement mechanisms specify that **only corporations, or people responsible for corporations**, are subject to income tax enforcement.

The second government will use the *presumption* that you *are* a corporation until you rebut its presumption. *That’s the way it is*. DO NOT THINK you can use the information in this analysis – even by quoting Chief Justice John Roberts of the United States Supreme Court – to stop paying income taxes. It - Won’t - Work. In fact, the technical legal name for that particular argument is “**frivolous**.” Not “funny-frivolous.” But “go-to-jail-frivolous.”

Point #10: Generalization – A Bridge Too Far

Contrary to what most people think, judges can’t just rule on something if they think it’s wrong. They have to wait for an appropriate case to come to them, and sometimes it never does. Cases have all sorts of issues and parts to them. Sometimes a case will seem to be about one thing, but it’s actually about another. If political operatives have decided that certain types of cases will be ruled against by certain judges, every effort will be made by those operatives to keep those cases out of the courts. Thus a judge can wait a whole career, and never rule on what he or she wants to rule on. The opposite is also true. Sometimes a case shows up, and a judge realizes – this is it, now or never. Another opportunity may never come, or come too late to matter, so they act.

What did Chief Justice Roberts actually *do*? **He raised the alarm about something that goes far, far beyond Obamacare**. It goes straight to the heart of why everyone is so upset. Roberts drew attention to the fact that, **by simply positioning anything they want as a tax, the government can force anyone to do anything at any time**. He made sure the vulnerability of the country to totally legal tyranny would not go away. Even if Obamacare was repealed, *his ruling would still stand*, and Congress could just try again with something else. Why would Roberts do such a thing? After all, he warned against the creation of “*a general federal authority akin to the police power*.” And he also said, “*our respect for Congress’s policy judgments thus can never extend so far as to disavow restraints on federal power that the Constitution carefully constructed*.” After saying these things, he went and *enabled* them? **NO he didn’t.**

He pointed out – subtly, but clearly, for those who follow his hints – that the powers Congress is trying to use against the People do not, in fact, apply to them, but only to corporations.

The man is a Federal judge – the TOP Federal judge. Do you think, even for a moment, Roberts isn't fully aware of what the IRS "legally" does to people? Of course he does. That's why he wrote the argument. HE wrote this argument – not YOU.

By *definition*, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court **is not frivolous**. Even by the interpretations of the IRS. Roberts jammed the machine. And scared the s--t out of the entire Federal government by doing it. *That's* why no other Justice would join him – he *terrified* them.

It was the only way he could halt the *unstoppable expansion* of a process that was *originally promised by Congress* to be limited **only** to the income tax – but technically could be applied to *anything*.

What is that process?

- The Federal government's **presumption** that natural human Americans had *volunteered* to be treated as corporations under the law;
- The Federal government's ability to do this **without telling them** that such a *presumption* had been made against them;
- The Federal government's ability to *use* this presumption to **deny Americans their inalienable rights**; by *replacing* them with government-controlled corporate **privileges**;
- And finally, the Federal government's ability to **not tell Americans how to get out of that presumption without being harmed** trying to do so.

When Obamacare came up as a tax law, Roberts – and *all* the Justices – knew what it meant. As long as the *only* application of tax laws were for income taxes, that single application stood as a kind of protection, but with a second application, the principle became *generalized*, and with that, the door swung open to abuse. Roberts didn't make it legal. It was made legal before he was even born.

People *have* a constitutional right to contract. **Contracts can be presumed by behavior. Ignorance of the law is not an excuse.** It's all there – but in its application to tax laws, and now Obamacare (and with *that* literally everything else), it has become *diabolical*.

Congress is obviously licking its chops to expand this principle of empowerment through tax enforcement. Obamacare, or something like it, or something else, would come back again, and again, and again – and each time it would be, *technically*, constitutional. So Roberts took a stand. Like John Hancock signing his name big enough on the Declaration of Independence to make sure the King saw it, Chief Justice Roberts ensured with the signing of his ruling that **unless people read and understand his directives, no one is ever going home to freedom again.** **The only way out of this problem is for Americans to know about it, understand it, and craft a constitutional protection against it. Not against corporations, but against people being treated as corporations, and *losing their rights*, through presumption.**

Remember Pelosi gloating that you'd have to *pass* Obamacare to *see* what was in it? She was telling the truth about the second government's use of *presumption*. The government *presumes* you've voluntarily **surrendered your humanity for corporate status** (remember the ALL-CAP NAME), then passes bills without telling you what's in them, because *you have no right to*

know what your corporate masters are doing. Pelosi didn't say she'd *explain* it, but **you could read it**, if it was passed.

The IRS is allowed to **presume** corporate laws apply to you too. The government *doesn't have to tell you* you're being treated as a **volunteer corporation**. They rule your claims of humanity are *frivolous* because **you're obeying corporate laws and standing in a corporate administrative court**. This *presumption* has been *repeatedly* ruled as Constitutional. You just didn't *know* it.

You can see why those who would convert the *entirety* of the Constitution into tax laws, are *drunk on presumptions*. That's why when she was asked if Obamacare was Constitutional, Pelosi replied "Are you serious!? Are you serious!?" She mocked the question as *frivolous*, because in doing so she limited her response to *only incorporated "persons"*! She said this as *Speaker of the House of Representatives*. In other words, she specifically invoked *the power of presumption* by using *contempt*, in order to *hide* behind its legal protections. Government employees use this indemnification technique all the time, because **the people don't know it's a legal statement!**

Before Obamacare, *secret presumptions* meant income tax. **SECRET PRESUMPTIONS is the monumental problem Roberts has chosen to expose with his courageous ruling**. And he did it now because our country is poised on the edge of a precipice - **right now**.

Compared to the absolute catastrophe of *generalizing* secret taxing authority presumption, Obamacare is merely *one* example, with an infinite number of the same kinds of tax laws right behind it, waiting only for Congress' vote.

Roberts also showed the SOLUTION to the problem, when he wrote, "*The Framers created a Federal Government of limited powers, and assigned to this Court the duty of enforcing those limits. But the Court does not express any opinion on the wisdom of the Affordable Care Act. Under the Constitution, that judgment is reserved to the people.*"

Only *the People* can put a *Constitutional Stop* to the government's current LEGAL use of the secret presumption of corporate status against human beings. *Robert's can't do that*.

Chief Justice Roberts has warned the American People of what is being done to them, how it is being done, and the imminent danger of its expansion of use.

What the American People will now *do* about this remains to be seen. One thing is sure, the more people who know about it, the better. Peaceful change can only come from knowledge.