

## THE SUPREME COURT RULING ON OBAMACARE

### Introduction

On June 28, 2012 the Supreme Court of the United States of America ruled by a 5-4 vote that ObamaCare, known by its legislative bill name *Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act*, is constitutional. The majority opinion was written by Chief Justice John Roberts, who went left on the issue and concocted quite a twist of logic to support Barack Hussein Obama's goal of government-imposed health care for Americans. The dissenting opinion was written by Justice Anthony Kennedy. Succinctly, it says: "The act is invalid in its entirety."

Chief Justice Roberts wrote, "The Affordable Care Act is constitutional in part and unconstitutional in part. The individual mandate cannot be upheld as an exercise of Congress's power under the Commerce Clause. That Clause authorizes Congress to regulate interstate commerce, not to order individuals to engage it. In this case, however, it is reasonable to construe what Congress has done as increasing taxes on those who have a certain amount of income, but choose to go without health insurance. Such legislation is within Congress's power to tax." The quintessence is that the federal mandate is not a real mandate. It is a tax. All of the lower courts except the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals said that the federal mandate was a mandate and not a tax.<sup>1</sup> "The Federal Government does not have the power to order people to buy health insurance. Section 5000A (of the Affordable Care Act) 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. ... The Affordable Care Act's requirement that certain individuals pay a financial penalty for not obtaining health

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.forbes.com/sites/aroy/2011/09/08/breaking-4th-circuit-rejects-two-obamacare-challenges-on-procedural-grounds/>

insurance may reasonably be characterized as a tax. Because the *Constitution* permits such a tax, it is not our role to forbid it, or to pass upon its wisdom or fairness.” This is the scapegoat twist in logic that Chief Justice Roberts invented to allow him to vote in favor of ObamaCare's being constitutional.

Ergo: ObamaCare is a tax, which is what Obama said it would never be! LIE!<sup>2</sup> Are you surprised? Don't be! Be angry! Show you anger on November 6, 2012.

## Initial Thoughts

This author's initial thoughts on the matter are:

I wonder: What information for blackmail does Obama have on Chief Justice Roberts? There are some very unusual matters that connect him to Obama and vice-versa.

1. There is the private visit Obama made to the Supreme Court, in reality, Chief Justice Roberts, before Obama became the occupier of the Oval Office. As far as history books can recollect, this is the first time that a not-yet inaugurated President made a private visit to the Supreme Court before his inauguration. Was Barack Hussein Obama *reaching* the Chief Justice? The American public should know the reasons for such a visit.
2. There is the re-taking of the oath of office on 22 January 2009. Was it legal? The law says that the President of the United States of America is to be inaugurated on January 20. The oath of office was the false oath (one word was spoken out of sequence). Being the false oath, it

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AAmtNCtdWeo&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AAmtNCtdWeo&feature=player_embedded)

should have been corrected immediately. Chief Justice Roberts did correct it immediately but Barack Hussein Obama did not repeat the correct sequence of words. Chief Justice Roberts should have made him say the correct sequence of words immediately. At a private ceremony in the Map Room of the White House two days later he did.<sup>3</sup> Strictly speaking, Barack Hussein Obama was not inaugurated on January 20. You can call it nit-picking if you want. Yet, those who pick nits are correct in their pickings! The actions Barack Hussein Obama took between the non-oath ceremony and the second-oath ceremony on 22 January may not have any legal basis due to the false oath. As a matter of fact, Obama's actions have no legal basis anyway because he is a putative president and usurper of power.

3. There is the uncanny tit-for-tat relationship that started between Chief Justice John Roberts and Barack Hussein Obama in March of 2010.<sup>4</sup>
4. There is the support Chief Justice Roberts gave Obama in the Arizona immigration law ruling.
5. There is the present ruling in favor of ObamaCare.

Was Chief Justice Roberts born in Chicago? In Kenya? In Honolulu?

The decision is a scapegoat way out! If: "It is not our role to forbid it, or pass upon its wisdom or fairness"...<sup>5</sup>, then whose role is it if not that which belongs to the supreme law decision making body of the American Republic? If it is not the Supreme Court's "role to forbid it, or pass upon

---

<sup>3</sup> [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/obama\\_inauguration/7843881.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/obama_inauguration/7843881.stm)

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2010/0310/Chief-Justice-John-Roberts-and-Obama-White-House-a-tit-for-tat>

<sup>5</sup> <http://washington.cbslocal.com/2012/06/28/supreme-court-rules-on-obamas-health-care-law/>

its wisdom or fairness ...," then the Supreme Court should have refused to hear the case in the first place.

It seems to me that Congress, the new, hopefully Republican-controlled Senate with backbone, should immediately begin impeachment proceedings if Obama is re-elected, or legal action against Obama if he is not re-elected, and prove that he is not a natural born citizen. They could apply their findings to matters retroactively since January 20/22, 2009, and therefore declare that every law that he signed as Mr. PP (Putable President) was and is null and void.

This author firmly believes that Chief Justice Roberts has no definitive character spine. He was/is certainly afraid of going down in history as a racist judge! It would not be advisable to live the rest of one's life with such a Chief-Justice-Roberts conscience!

So much for this author's initial position.

Definitely, there are unclarified connections between Barack Hussein Obama and Chief Justice John Roberts. Because such a relationship needs to be explained, there are grounds to claim that Chief Justice Roberts was in a conflict of interest in his decision. Should this be the case, then:

Chief Justice Roberts! You should discard your robes. You did not keep your oath of office. You are a disgrace to justice and freedom!

## **Second Thoughts**

Now is the time for a re-evaluation statement: Could it be possible that Chief Justice John Roberts was so clever to say that ObamaCare is a tax? The result will be

that the American people will become more involved in the presidential election and that the Republicans can win both the House of Representatives and the Senate in great majorities. Was Chief Justice Roberts therefore making an active contribution to the election process? Was it the judge's intent to make ObamaCare the theme of the presidential election campaign? **The crux of the discussion will now be OBAMA CARE IS AN OBAMA TAX. Obama is responsible. Americans are taxed enough already. Vote him and his gang out of office.**

Another possible clever out is that Chief Justice Roberts gave the separate states a possible emergency exit by stating that the states are able to opt out of Medicaid Expansion. The Supreme Court struck down the mandate that states must add people to Medicaid. (Yes, in ObamaCare there are mandates and there are no mandates!!!)

In the *Ulsterman Report* the White House Insider says,

"And the initial reports I'm getting are telling me there was a lot more clever going on inside that decision than the initial reaction will indicate.

**It's the Obama Tax now.** And states were given an out. **The entire law is a big ass convoluted mess and the ruling has reinforced that fact.**

Obama will have to defend something he doesn't understand, and Romney can now sit back and just repeat over and over again "repeal-repeal-repeal."

You can call bullsh-t on me here and I'll understand if you do but I'm telling you right up this ruling today is GOOD NEWS. Politically, as a motivator, it's great news. Watch contributions toward Republicans jump up even more than they already were. Watch the Obama White House have to face very hard questions over the Obamacare tax issue. Watch states rise up to challenge the administration using the weapon the Supreme Court placed in their hands to do so. Watch the Tea Party come back stronger and more powerful than ever.

**The giant has woken up. Country needed a hard kick in the ass to remind us what is at stake in November. Now we are truly ready to fight."**<sup>6</sup>

Is this what Chief Justice John Roberts has done without intending to do it? He has awakened the country. The Supreme Court's decision has re-written a law. The Supreme Court has no right to do this.<sup>7</sup>

## **Closure**

The **Initial Thoughts** contain some truthful seeds. The **Second Thoughts** also contain some elements of truth. However, this author does not believe that Chief Justice John Roberts considered these matters intentionally. Is it possible for Chief Justice Roberts to be proud of his decision? Pride is a question of backbone and showing that one can stand straight in the face of adversaries. Pride is not straddling a fence and making oneself be liked. There surely seems to be a lot of stretching and *reaching* that took place!

The American electorate will have reason to be proud of themselves if they vote Barack Hussein Obama out of office on November 6, 2012.

Frederick William Dame

Patriotic, Steadfast, and True

June 29, 2012.

---

<sup>6</sup> (<http://theulstermanreport.com/2012/06/28/white-house-insider-obamacare-now-we-are-truly-ready-to-fight/>)

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/304311/chief-justice-roberts-s-folly-editors>