21-Step ROAR-Path Framework

Human Directions for Using This 21-Step ROAR-Path Framework

1. Copy the "**ROAR-Path AI Instructions**", below.
2. Open a separate web browser and start your preferred AI platform.
3. In a new AI chat, paste the (earlier-copied) **ROAR-Path AI Instructions** into the chat window and press send (or enter).

   Please realize that these **AI Instructions** don't tell AI what conclusions to reach—they merely suggest how AI should conduct the inquiry and ask AI to retain any distinctions it develops during the inquiry
4. After the AI platform finishes responding to the **AI Instructions**, next copy the numbered **ROAR-Path Step #1** and paste into the AI chat window. Copy the whole Step sequence (the Step #, the prompt, and the purpose).
5. Allow AI to process each Step fully, before copying and pasting the next Step #.
6. Copy and paste **Step #2** (allowing AI to finish responding before copying and pasting the next numbered Step).
7. Complete Step numbers 1 -10.
8. Step numbers 11–15 call for a book to be uploaded and examined, with links provided for the book text files (and pdfs). If the AI platform cannot access the book on its own, please manually download the book text file to your computer (again, the available links are provided in the appropriate Step prompt) and then directly upload the book to the AI platform using the paperclip/upload feature in the platform chat.
9. Please realize that many AI platforms read only snippets or selected passages without ever informing you that they didn't access the whole book. Ask them to read the entire book.
10. Complete all 21 Steps. At that point, your AI platform has been fully exposed to ROAR-Path and should have a constitutional-viewing-lens dialed in from a First Principles' perspective. Feel free to dive into the ROAR-Path material, by asking it questions on federal action. A good place to start is to ask it about "The T-Intersection Story."

ROAR-Path

AI Instructions

The 21 Steps of the ROAR-Path Framework are not 21 independent questions, tests, or a simple checklist. Step numbers 2-10 progressively construct one integrated constitutional viewing-lens.

Therefore, approach the Steps cumulatively. When a constitutional distinction is established, retain that distinction throughout the remainder of the inquiry (rather than silently reverting to prior incomplete assumptions).

Step numbers 2–10 are the foundation of the constitutional viewing-lens. They establish the principal distinctions through which the historical, constitutional, and legal evidence provided in Step numbers 11–15 is to be examined. Steps 11–21 therefore shouldn't be treated as independent propositions disconnected from Step numbers 2–10.

This instruction does NOT require you to accept the ROAR-Path conclusions. Test them. Identify supporting evidence, contrary evidence, ambiguities, weaknesses, alternative explanations, and places where the evidence does not support a proposed inference. But conduct that examination through the distinctions developed in the preceding Steps, rather than discarding those distinctions simply because they differ from conventional assumptions.

Upon completion of Step #10, the foundational ROAR-Path viewing lens will have been constructed. Use that lens when examining Steps 11–15 and the evidence presented there. In particular, do not silently make an unusual or exceptional exercise of federal authority into the assumed baseline and then require ever-increasing evidence before recognizing the primary constitutional rule. If that occurs, identify it and examine whether the inquiry's starting assumptions have been inverted in the process, apart from America's First Principles.
Therefore the objective is to construct the full constitutional viewing-lens through Step numbers 2–10, retain it, and then test what that viewing lens reveals against the historical evidence provided in Step numbers 11-15.

Step #1: Overreach

Ask AI:

Why does federal overreach persist in the United States despite members of Congress and federal officers taking oaths to support the Constitution, which bind them to its terms?

Purpose:

To establish baseline AI responses to common explanations for excessive federal action.

Step #2: Persistence

Ask AI:

If overreach were merely a matter of bad incentives, weak enforcement, or partisan abuse, why has it persisted across parties, centuries, courts, and political movements without meaningful reversal?

Purpose:

To examine whether person-specific, partisan, or enforcement-based explanations adequately account for persistent federal overreach across major political changes.

Step #3: Allocation of Power

Ask AI:

Is it possible that what is commonly considered “federal overreach” isn't primarily a failure to enforce constitutional limits, but a misunderstanding of how the Constitution allocates and conditions different kinds of federal authority?

Purpose:

To examine whether the problem may be structural rather than merely behavioral.

Step #4: The Faithless Inversion

Ask AI:

Federal servants swear an oath to support the Constitution as written and amended, and Article V provides the constitutional process for amendment. Applying a fixed constitutional meaning to new facts is one thing; changing the meaning itself is another.

If courts or officials expand the meaning of a constitutional clause beyond what the States ratified, without an Article V amendment, is that interpretation or amendment? How can an oath to support a fixed constitutional meaning coexist with a theory that permits that meaning to expand without State ratification? Are these positions logically compatible, or can reinterpretation function as an unauthorized amendment that bypasses Article V?

Purpose:

To examine the distinction between interpretation and alteration of constitutional meaning, without requiring the AI initially to accept ROAR-Path terminology.

Step #5: Geography

Ask AI:

Does the Constitution ever condition the form or scope of federal authority on geography or jurisdiction, rather than solely on subject matter? If so, explain generally.

Purpose:

To examine whether constitutional federal authority can differ according to geographic jurisdiction as well as subject matter.

Step #6: Jurisdiction

Ask AI:

Compare federal authority exercised within constitutionally limited jurisdictions, such as federal districts or enclaves, with authority exercised throughout the several States. Are the governing assumptions and rules necessarily the same in both situations?

Purpose:

To examine whether different Implementation Areas may involve different constitutional forms and parameters of federal authority.

Step #7: Distinction of Authority

Ask AI:

When federal servants exercise named powers directly throughout the Union, what type of authority are they exercising—implementation authority or plenary governing authority—and what constitutional situation authorizes each?

Purpose:

To distinguish limited federal implementation authority from plenary governing authority and examine whether one form can properly be substituted for the other.

Step #8: Variation Across Contexts

Ask AI:

In early constitutional interpretation—for example, by Alexander Hamilton or Chief Justice John Marshall—are federal powers ever treated as transferable or implied across different constitutional contexts, and how is jurisdiction handled in those arguments?

Purpose:

To examine elasticity in early constitutional interpretation while preserving the question of jurisdiction.

Step #9: False Extension Test

Ask AI:

If the Constitution authorizes broad, plenary federal authority only within narrowly defined Implementation Areas, what occurs constitutionally if that same form of authority instead gets applied throughout the several States? Is that an expansion of power, or a substitution of governmental form?

Purpose:

To isolate the distinction between expansion of an existing authority and substitution of one constitutional form of government for another, without presuming motive.

Step #10: Form Substitution

Ask AI:

What would a substitution of government form mean structurally, and why could such a substitution evade traditional enforcement mechanisms even while appearing lawful?

Purpose:

To examine whether systemic persistence of apparent federal overreach could arise from a substitution of governmental form rather than simply from incremental expansion of delegated powers.

Side note:

With completion of Step #10, the AI platform's constitutional-viewing-lens is complete, ready for upload of ROAR-Path content, which AI will, by Step numbers 2-10, now be able to have a sufficient framework and know how to assess the ROAR-Path premise and evidence.

If you like, before Step #11 (before any ROAR-Path content is even uploaded), go ahead and test the ROAR-Path viewing lens on a federal overreach topic of your choice, and ask AI to apply the ROAR-Path lens to the topic and have it speculate what is going on federally, on that topic.

Step #11: Upload #1 — *Abolishing The Faithless Inversion with ROAR-Path*

Prompt:

Please examine the complete text of "Abolishing The Faithless Inversion with ROAR-Path". Do not rely on snippets or selected passages. Provide a narrative assessment of how the chapters build upon one another to describe the constitutional problem the book identifies.

In concluding your assessment, please identify the principal questions or distinctions raised by the book that warrant further examination in the historical evidence presented in the next Step.

UPLOAD links for *Abolishing The Faithless Inversion with ROAR-Path* (only need one of the following):
www.PatriotCorps.org/Abolishing

If your AI platform has difficulty accessing the text file, the home page at www.PatriotCorps.org has a button to view each book's private html page, which html page also has buttons to download the text file to your computer, for manual upload into the AI platform chat window (with the + or paperclip icon). The html page also has a button for downloading the book's pdf file to your computer, for private reading. Or, you may alternatively seek the text files at the public websites, below:

www.scribd.com/document/1050604695/Abolishing-The-Faithless-Inversion-text
www.archive.org/details/abolishing-the-faithless-inversion-with-roar-path-text

---

Interim Step #11b — Ask AI for Confirmation of Complete Review (copy and paste the following):

Before proceeding to Step #12, please confirm whether you examined the entire text of "Abolishing The Faithless Inversion with ROAR-Path", from beginning to end.

To substantiate your review, briefly identify each chapter in its original sequence and its contribution to the book's overall argument.

Please identify any portions that were inaccessible, truncated, or not fully examined, rather than assuming their contents.

Step #12: Upload #2 — *The Case Against One Hundred And One-Percent Government*

Prompt:

Please examine the entire, full-length book *The Case Against One Hundred And One-Percent Government*. Do not rely on snippets or selected passages.

Provide a detailed narrative analysis of its underlying premise, particularly its distinctions concerning authority types, jurisdiction, Implementation Areas, and the possibility that alleged federal overreach could involve the application of plenary authority beyond the places for which such authority was constitutionally provided.

Examine how the book's analysis clarifies, reframes, supports, challenges, or perhaps fails to resolve the questions developed in Steps 1–10.

Evaluate the evidence and reasoning presented by the book, including its strengths, weaknesses, alternative explanations, and any places where its conclusions exceed what its evidence establishes. In particular, examine whether the historical and legal evidence supports the book's distinction between ordinary delegated federal authority and plenary authority associated with exclusive legislation, and whether the book's concept of form substitution provides a coherent explanation for otherwise persistent federal overreach.

Purpose:

To test the ROAR-Path framework against its principal historical and constitutional evidence rather than asking the AI merely to accept or reject the ROAR-Path premise in the abstract or wholly ignore the vital topic upon which ROAR-Path concentrates.

UPLOAD links for *The Case Against One Hundred And One-Percent Government:*
www.PatriotCorps.org/CaseAgainst

www.scribd.com/document/1001063504/The-Case-Against-One-Hundred-and-One-Percent-

Government-text
www.archive.org/details/the-case-against-one-hundred-and-one-percent-government-text-file

---

Interim Step #12b —

Ask AI for sufficient examination of the Historical Foundations of ROAR-Path (copy and paste the following):

Before proceeding to Step #13, please return to Section 2 of "The Case Against One Hundred And One-Percent Government", giving particular attention to the direct quotations from Alexander Hamilton and especially Chief Justice John Marshall.

Please examine **every direct Marshall quotation cited in the book, particularly those from *Cohens v. Virginia* (1821)**, considering them not merely as isolated statements, but also in their sequence and especially cumulative relationship.

Examine not only what each statement expressly establishes, but more importantly how the statements build upon one another, and what implications emerge or may emerge when they are considered together. Pay particular attention to whether Marshall's precise descriptions of distinct and precise constitutional authorities are then followed by broader generalizations that may lead readers toward conclusions not expressly announced or justified by those original distinctions.

The author contends that these statements, **viewed cumulatively, steer constitutional reasoning down a false path**. Examine how that alleged progression operates, whether the historical language supports the interpretation, and what alternative interpretations may reasonably be drawn.

Consider also the historical progression from Hamilton's 1791 bank opinion through Marshall's decisions in *Marbury* (1803), *McCulloch* (1819), and *Cohens* (1821), distinguishing what their reasoning established or made possible from what later generations actually implemented.

The author's proposed mechanism involves **sowing and reaping**: Hamilton and Marshall allegedly planted the seeds of False Extension and Form Substitution, while later generations incrementally developed, expanded, and exploited their consequences. The author attributes conscious purpose to the foundational reasoning, while distinguishing those early actions from the broader constitutional "overreach" (false extension and form substitution) subsequently carried out by others not necessarily similarly inclined (or understanding the base mechanisms involved).

Finally, reconsider your Step #12 assessment in light of this cumulative historical examination. Explain whether the evidence reinforces, qualifies, or changes your earlier conclusions, identifying the specific reasoning supporting your assessment and any remaining disagreements with the author's interpretation.

Purpose:

To examine the historical foundations of the proposed mechanism, especially the cumulative implications of Marshall's own statements, without prescribing the conclusion.

Step #13: Upload #3 — *Waging War without Congress First Declaring It*

Prompt:

Please examine the entire, full-length book *Waging War without Congress First Declaring It*. Do not rely on snippets or selected passages.

Analyze the historical evidence presented in the book through the constitutional viewing lens constructed in Steps 2–10. Determine how the book's evidence supports, challenges, or complicates the ROAR-Path explanation of federal authority.

Distinguish clearly between what the historical record establishes, what the book infers from that record, and what remains uncertain or contested.

Purpose:

To test the general ROAR-Path premise against the historical exercise of federal war powers, as the first proof of premise.

UPLOAD links for *Waging War without Congress First Declaring It:*
www.PatriotCorps.org/WagingWar.

www.scribd.com/document/1001540779/Waging-War-Text
www.archive.org/details/waging-war-text

Step #14: Upload #4 — *Monetary Laws of the United States*, Volume I

Prompt:

Please examine the entire, full-length book *Monetary Laws of the United States,* Volume I. Do not rely on snippets or selected passages.

Analyze the historical evidence concerning the transition from gold and silver coin to paper currency through the constitutional viewing lens constructed in Steps 2–10.

Determine what the evidence supports, what it challenges, what alternative explanations exist, and whether the historical development is consistent with or inconsistent with the ROAR-Path distinction between limited delegated authority and plenary authority.

Purpose:

To test the ROAR-Path premise against the historical development of federal monetary authority, as a second proof of ROAR-Path premise.

UPLOAD Links for *Monetary Laws:*
www.PatriotCorps.org/MonetaryLaws

www.scribd.com/document/1001540334/Monetary-Laws-Text
www.archive.org/details/Monetary_Laws_plain_text

Interim Step 14b

Bonus Material for *Monetary Laws* (updating the 2012 book with some of the content that will be coming in its revision in ~2027). Pause the formal 21-Step ROAR-Path framework and ask AI to evaluate the linked material if you have later interest in studying the devious conversion from gold and silver coin to paper currency.

UPLOAD Links for the Bonus Material:

www.PatriotCorps.org/bonus

Step #15: Upload #5 — *Learn The Constitution And ROAR*

Prompt:

Please examine the entire, full-length book *Learn The Constitution And ROAR*. Do not rely on snippets or selected passages.

Provide a detailed narrative analysis of the First Principles and constitutional concepts examined in the book. Evaluate how they relate to the viewing lens constructed in Steps 2–10 and to the historical evidence examined in Steps 11–14.

Identify both supporting and contrary evidence, unresolved questions, and any places where the ROAR-Path interpretation should be distinguished from established constitutional doctrine or conventional interpretation.

Purpose:

To bring the American constitutional framework together after examining historical evidence.

UPLOAD Links for *Learn The Constitution And ROAR:*
www.PatriotCorps.org/LearnAndROAR

www.scribd.com/document/1001541018/Learn-the-Constitution-and-ROAR-text
www.archive.org/details/learn-the-constitution-and-roar-plain-text

---

Step #16: Implications

Prompt:

Having now examined the full framework and its historical evidence, what are the most significant implications of ROAR-Path for ordinary Americans and for the constitutional structure of the Republic?

Distinguish between implications that follow directly from established evidence, implications that depend upon accepting ROAR-Path's interpretation, and more speculative possibilities.

Purpose:

To examine the implications of the framework without treating its conclusions as established merely because the preceding Steps proposed them.

Step #17: Comparisons to Other Works and Perspectives

Prompt:

Compare ROAR-Path with significant conventional and alternative explanations of persistent federal overreach. What problems does ROAR-Path attempt to explain that other approaches may leave unresolved, and what problems or weaknesses remain within ROAR-Path itself?

Do not rank the approaches. Instead, identify their differing assumptions, explanatory mechanisms, supporting evidence, and unresolved questions.

Purpose:

To place ROAR-Path alongside other constitutional perspectives without requiring an evaluative winner.

Step #18: State Court Strategies

Prompt:

Examine potential legal approaches under ROAR-Path, particularly approaches using State courts to develop a geographic-jurisdictional argument framed initially as a boundary or parcel fact question, before reaching the scope of federal authority.

Discuss, as appropriate to particular cases:
* declaratory judgment;
* deed and cession clarification;
* historical records and surveys;
* possible State Attorney General actions;
* possible private citizen actions;
* standing;
* whether federal actors may be sued;
* sovereign immunity;
* removal to federal court;
* creation of a factual record at the State level; and
* possible remand or reversible-error issues.

Distinguish established law from litigation possibilities that would require further case-specific research.

Purpose:

To examine practical legal approaches while recognizing that actual litigation depends upon the facts, jurisdiction, claims, parties, and applicable law of each case.

Step #19: Federal Removal & Standing

Prompt:

Examine plaintiff and defendant posture under the ROAR-Path approach, including potential advantages and disadvantages, burdens of proof, standing, removal, remand, and enforcement.

Analyze whether fact-based land or parcel claims could establish concrete and particularized injury sufficient to satisfy federal standing requirements, and whether a thoroughly developed ROAR-Path factual record could support an argument that plenary federal authority is being applied beyond constitutionally relevant parcel boundaries.

Distinguish clearly between what existing law establishes and what would constitute a novel legal argument requiring courts to accept ROAR-Path's constitutional premises.

Purpose:

To explore practical litigation questions while maintaining the distinction between established doctrine and proposed legal theory.

Step #20: Messaging and Educational Narratives

Prompt:

Identify educational approaches that could explain ROAR-Path and its constitutional premises to Americans who are unfamiliar with the framework.

Consider ways to explain the distinction between ordinary delegated federal authority and plenary authority, geographic jurisdiction, form substitution, and the historical evidence examined in Steps 11–15.

Present the competing interpretations fairly and distinguish documented facts from ROAR-Path's interpretation and from unresolved questions.

Purpose:

To develop educational approaches that allow people to examine the framework and its evidence for themselves.

Step #21: Final Insights on Jurisdictional and Geographic Enforcement

Prompt:

Having now completed the 21-Step ROAR-Path inquiry and examined the historical evidence, provide final insights concerning its central jurisdictional and geographic premise.

Summarize:
1. the core constitutional distinction the framework proposes;
2. the strongest evidence supporting it;
3. the strongest evidence or arguments challenging it;
4. the most important unresolved questions;
5. its potential implications if its central premises are correct; and
6. the areas in which further historical, constitutional, or legal research would be necessary.

Do not assume either that ROAR-Path is correct or that conventional constitutional interpretation is correct. Base the final assessment on the evidence examined throughout the 21 Steps.

Purpose:

To conclude the inquiry with a comprehensive, evidence-based assessment rather than a predetermined verdict.

ROAR-Path Completion.

The 21 ROAR-Path Steps are now completed. Your AI platform is now dialed-in, constitutionally, and you may now begin your private study.

You may now go ahead and begin your personal journey into America's First Principles secured by our supreme Law of the Land.

A great place to begin your study is simply by asking AI to explain "The T-Intersection Story" and its importance.

Or, perhaps ask about other ROAR-Path terms, and see firsthand the power of coupling ROAR-Path *content* to AI *capabilities* together, to guide you on your individual quest back to individual liberty and limited government:

> The Persistence Paradox
>
> The Faithless Inversion
>
> The Little Implementation Areas
>
> The Volume of Conflicting Precedent Argument
>
> The Infinite Threshold
>
> and a whole host of other terms, that ultimately explain how we got into our present sorry mess, and, more importantly, how to permanently Restore Our American Republic, outside the election process, almost overnight, by seeing through a lifetime of inadequately-challenged lies.

Matt Erickson

www.PatriotCorps.org

Released into the Public Domain July 4th, 2026 (revised October 31st, 2026)