

Obamacare Ruling Explained

<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/2903818/posts?page=51>

I of all people am for independent thinking and action on the part of people, but we have been sooo brainwashed by the government and U.S. press most people don't have a clue as to what is happening.

You should certainly do what you want, but I HIGHLY suggest you DO NOT sign up for Obamacare until you read this CAREFULLY. Chief Justice Roberts carefully worded his ruling and left out any [requirement](#) to participate for 95% of Americans.

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

“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?

Because 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 possibly do except someone with his vast power at their fingertips – he actually looked up the law that Obamacare quoted. And when he did, 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.

Then, after reading these 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.

And what exactly is § 6671 (a)? It a 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?

People can disagree with him if they want, but how the hell can anyone say Roberts is “legislating from the bench” when he simply repeats back *pre-existing* tax law that *Obamacare references for itself*? Of course, [the answer](#) to that question is simple – no one actually *looked up the laws* before they decided that 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? *Right*? And isn’t that *exactly* what the Chief Justice did here?

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.

So you’re 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.”
- Therefore, 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...”*

And 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 it’s 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).*”

Look what stands out – what Roberts is saying are “*tools that may be used to collect the penalty*” are actually, if you look at his parenthetical [descriptions](#), *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*”? And besides, 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 an *actual* “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 be seized with just a “notice of lien” to back up the levy. Hey, thanks a *lot*.

So what are we left with here? 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 to 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 carefully, this ruling is dealing with a law that was written to deceive. You have to be very careful in your reading of both 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

So what else is Obamacare being deceptive about?

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 those 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. Thus, 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. Now, liens are only useful to enable levies, so definitions for levy powers also reference lien powers. And 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 at this point, to compare the three definitions of “person” cited from references 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.”

Notice that generally speaking, for 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.

But compare: the general definition of “person” in § 7701 (a) (1) above says it’s just “*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.*”

So what does this difference in the 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 to the government, 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 that 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).

So 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.

And in his ruling, 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

So 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 in any event, 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: *The term “taxpayer” means any person subject to any internal revenue tax.*

So it’s clear that both individuals and persons *may* be subject to tax, depending on *what* definitions of those terms apply to them.

IF they are liable, THEN they are referred to as “taxpayers.”

That's why *both* the income tax statutes *and* the Obamacare statutes make so much use of the term "taxpayers." When they are talking about someone who *might* be subject to the tax, then they use the terms "person" or "individual." But when they are talking about someone who absolutely *is* subject to the tax, then they use the term "taxpayer."

Point #6: Imposed Means Enforced – Part 2

Both the income tax, and Obamacare, start out by saying "a tax is imposed." Not "a tax is made," or a "tax exists," or just "a tax."

And imposed *means* enforced: If it can't be *enforced*, it can't be *imposed*.

So 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* the *enforcement* definition of "person."

And if it can't be *imposed* on you, you can't be a *taxpayer* for it.

And if you're *not* a taxpayer for it...

... *it doesn't apply to you.*

Point #7: News Flash – The Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court *Knows All of This*

But if he knows it, then why didn't he say it?

Well, he *did* say it. 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 it?

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's talking about what "The Federal Government" has "the power" to do. And as has been explained, you have to ask yourself: do *what*, to *whom*?

He says: "*the power to order people to buy*" 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.*

And, regarding "those 'persons,'" – and ONLY "those 'persons,'" – Chief Justice Roberts ruled that Obamacare IS Constitutional:

"*The Federal Government does have the power to impose a tax on those without health insurance.*"

HOWEVER, he also specifically ruled that against the *people* (as in We The People), Obamacare is NOT constitutional:

"*The Federal Government does not have the power to order people to buy health insurance.*"

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 a bit of a 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 personal behalf. And more, those limitations on the enforcement laws don't come out of Obamacare. Rather, they're a part of the income tax laws that have been there all along, and that Obamacare has attached itself to, in order to make use of them.

Can this really be possible? It would mean that there are two separate enforcement powers held by the Federal government – one for corporation “persons,” and one for non-corporate, regular human-being-type, natural persons. And that 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.

Well, let's look at Chief Justice Roberts again, and see what he said about this subject. 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.”* If you disregard the analysis presented above, then ask yourself - *what* two powers?

After all, isn't that why 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, well, 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 total, not two. So what's the difference between them? How do you turn three powers into two? And for that matter, why should there be 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. It deals with human beings acting as human beings and nothing else. That government has to deal with a position derived from those human beings. And those human beings are acknowledged as possessing God-given natural rights, that existed before the “government” was created, and which cannot be removed by that “government,” because it simply does not have the authority.

The *second* “government,” however, is exactly the opposite of the first one. The second “government” creates, controls and runs *corporations*. The very word “incorporate” means “give body to,” or “bring into existence.” And because that “government” creates corporations, it *owns* those corporation completely - *because of the fact* that it is their creator.

Thus legally, corporations are *slaves* to the “government” that created them, *by definition*. They are created, live in obedience to, and die at the command of that “government” – including *paying taxes* to that “government.” And 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, *those* are the two “governments” which comprise the two main *Federal jurisdictional powers* of our one *constitutional Republic*. And thus, *they* are the “two powers” to which Roberts is referring. And he acknowledges them *both as constitutionally legitimate*.

But he also warns that it is extremely dangerous to mix them up. In fact, 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.*"

But isn't that *exactly* what everyone is afraid Roberts has actually *done* with his ruling?

Yet *here* he is specifically warning everyone *against* making that interpretation of his ruling, and teaching that the way to avoid that terrible mistake is to "*read carefully.*"

So that's what this analysis is – a very, very careful reading. It is not *my* interpretation of Roberts. It is my careful reading of what *Roberts actually said*, per his specific instructions.

Two governmental powers exist. Roberts said so, and warned against confusing them. For 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.*"

So what does that mean? It means enabling the Federal government, through Obamacare, to start treating We The People of inalienable human rights, like wholly-owned government-privileged corporations, *for everything.*

Point #9: Bait and Switch and Presumption

But wait a second, (I imagine you say again). 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 *human* people-persons for the income tax?

Answer: You *volunteer* to be treated as a corporation.

Remember in his ruling that Roberts said that "without a careful reading" you can create "a general federal authority akin to the police power" concerning Obamacare?

Well concerning the income tax, most Americans have NOT made a "careful reading" of the tax laws, and therefore HAVE created a *specific* "federal authority akin to the police power" concerning the subject of 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*. What the government has done is argued to the courts – and the courts have agreed – that the government is not responsible for people's legal ignorance, and that if they act in such a way as to *functionally volunteer* to be treated as a corporation, *then the government gets to treat them like a corporation.*

Even worse, courts have agreed that neither they, nor other government officials, have to *tell you* you're being treated as a corporation, under the interpretation that you don't *need* to be told, since you *volunteered* in the first place.

And then, to top it off, the government has created rules to make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for you to *not* be treated like a corporation anymore, by presuming that until you have *proven* you're not a corporation, they get to pound down on you just as if you were a corporation that was *faking* being a human being. As a result, you can actually be convicted for fraud, and go to jail, for demanding you *not* be treated as if you were a corporation!

That's the way it is.

So the technical answer is *no*, 95% of Americans *don't* have to pay the income tax, because it's enforcement mechanisms specify that only corporations, or people responsible for corporations, are subject to income tax enforcement.

The *practical* answer, however, is that without a *lot* of money and legal representation, the government will use the *presumption* that you *are* a corporation against you to seize your money and property, and throw you in jail, *long* before you can get through all the court hearings necessary for them to admit that you are a non-corporate human being-type person. Or they will simply show you that that's what they are *going* to do to you, unless you sign a document agreeing that you *are*, in fact, a

corporation, *and* agree that you've been a very, very *bad* corporation, and that you deserve to pay all sorts of fines in order to stay out of jail.

That's the way it is.

So 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.

The IRS will simply STOMP you into oblivion, because legally, they get to treat you under the *presumption* that you *are* a corporation - *and they don't have to acknowledge any "presumed corporations" that try to claim they are not corporations.*

In fact, the technical legal name for that particular argument is "frivolous."

That's right, according to tax laws, interpretations and rulings, pointing out that you are a human being who does not fit the specifications of the actual income tax enforcement laws, is *frivolous*.

Not "funny-frivolous."

But rather, "go-to-jail-frivolous."

Read carefully: you're warned.

Point #10: Generalization – A Bridge Too Far

Contrary to what most people think, judges can't just go rule on something if they think it is wrong. They have to wait for an appropriate case to come to them, and sometimes it never does. Also, cases themselves 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. So for the purposes of what it seems to be about, it's useless. And if political operatives have decided that certain types of cases will be ruled against their interests by certain judges, every effort will be made by those operatives to keep those cases out of those 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.

That, I believe, is what Chief Justice Roberts has done with his Obamacare ruling. If he waited longer to make this ruling, Obamacare would be in another form, and perhaps not so amenable to exposure for what it really is. Or, such a vast bureaucracy will have been formed by the time he got to rule on it, that enormous damage to the country would have been done in the mean time. Or he simply might not have gotten to be the swing vote, and would have been out-voted no matter what his position was.

So he chose this, and he chose now.

But what did he actually *do*?

Simply put, he raised the alarm about something that goes far, far beyond Obamacare. In fact, it goes straight to the heart of why everyone is so upset. Roberts not only 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 certified that concept as *constitutional*. And by doing that, he made sure the vulnerability of the country to totally legal tyranny would not go away. For even if Obamacare was repealed, *his ruling would still stand*, and Congress could just try again with something else.

But why would Roberts do such a thing? After all, he actually warned against the creation of "*a general federal authority akin to the police power.*" And he also said elsewhere in his ruling, "*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.*" Yet after saying these things, he then went and *enabled* them!

Except he *didn't*. Because he pointed out – subtly, but clearly, for those who follow his hints as I have here – that these powers Congress is trying to use against the People do not, in fact, apply to them, but only to corporations.

But 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 who try to use Roberts own argument against them?

Of course he does.

That's why he wrote the argument. Because now HE wrote this argument – not YOU.

And *that matters*. Because *by definition*, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court *is not frivolous*. Even by the interpretations of the IRS.

You see, Roberts jammed the machine. And scared the *shit* out of the entire Federal government by doing it. *That's* why no other Justice would join him – he *terrified* them.

And he did it because it was the only way he could find to 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 was that process?

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

When Obamacare came up as a tax law, Roberts – and *all* the Justices – knew what this meant. It meant Congress had gone back on their promise to presume this terrible corporate tax power upon people *only* for the purpose of the income tax, and use it for *everything*. Because Obamacare was the *generalization* of this principle that opened the door to its infinite use. As long as the *only* application of these 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.

But the *real* problem was that it was legal. Yet Roberts did not make it legal – it was made legal before Roberts 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*.

So what was Roberts to do? Throw it out? If he did that, it would come back. Congress is obviously licking its chops over expanding 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 decided to make 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 Obamacare ruling that unless *everyone* works together, *no one* is *ever* going home to freedom again. **Because 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 you the truth about the government's use of *presumption*. The government *presumes* that you've voluntarily surrendered your humanity for corporate status, and then passes bills without telling you what's in them, because *you have no right to know* what your corporate masters are doing until they want to tell you.

Even then, they don't have to tell you – Pelosi didn't say she'd *explain* it, just that you could *read* it, if it was passed.

That's what happens if you fight the IRS, too – **they are allowed to presume the corporate laws apply to you, and that you therefore have to pay the tax** before you can challenge the tax in court. But then, if you pay and fight, **the government doesn't have to tell you you're being treated as a volunteer corporation. Instead, they rule that your claims of humanity are frivolous because you're obeying corporate laws and standing in a corporate administrative court.** This *secret presumption* been repeatedly ruled as Constitutional. You just don't *know* about it.

So you can see why those who would convert the *entirety* of the Constitution into tax laws, are *drunk* on the mechanism of *presumption*. That's why Pelosi replied, when asked if Obamacare was Constitutional, "Are you serious!? Are you serious!?" Look at her reply *legally*: she mocked the question as *frivolous*, because in doing so she limited her response to *only incorporated "persons"*!

And remember, she was saying this as *Speaker of the House of Representatives*. In other words, she wasn't without authority when she said it. She specifically invoked *the power of secret presumption* by using *contempt*, in order to *hide* behind it's 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 presumption meant income tax.** Now, it means people forced to face death panels and perform abortions against their religious beliefs – when they *don't* have to!

That's why SECRET PRESUMPTION 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* the secret taxing authority presumption, all the hell of Obamacare is merely *one* example, with an infinite number of the same kinds of tax laws right behind it, waiting only for Congress to vote.

But 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 currently LEGAL use of the **secret presumption of corporate status against human beings.** Robert's can't do that himself. But in a single astonishing ruling, 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 problem remains to be seen. One thing is sure, though – the more people who know about it, the better. Peaceful change can only come from knowledge.

So pass the word.

REMEMBER -- If you forward this, please remove email addresses before you send it on, and use the BCC area when sending to several people at once.

"When government fears the people there will be liberty.
When people fear the government there will be tyranny"
~ Thomas Jefferson ~
"The liberties of a people never were, nor ever will be, secure,
when the transactions of their rulers may be concealed from them."
~ Patrick Henry ~

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message (including attachments) is covered by the United States Electronic Communication Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C. sections 2510-2521 and various similar acts and laws worldwide, is CONFIDENTIAL, and constitutes non-public information intended to be conveyed only to the designated recipient(s). If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this e-mail, including attachments, and notify me. The unauthorized use, retention, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this e-mail, including attachments, is prohibited and may be unlawful.