

The Case against Obama

The Crux of the Matter Is Not Nativity but Documentation

by David Solway



A Highly Problematic Dossier

It was obvious to me when I first began studying the phenomenally popular Obama early on in his heady career that there was something fishy about him. His words and promises and his very manner reminded me of Jonathan Swift's [broomstick](#), "set up to be a universal reformer and corrector of abuses, a remover of grievances, [who] raises a mighty dust where there was none before, sharing deeply all the while in the very same pollutions he pretends to sweep away." As I delved further into Obama's evasions, his platitudes, his origins, his friends and mentors, and the fact that all his important records were sealed, my discomfort deepened.

Let us consider. As has been reliably [reported](#)—and which should be common knowledge by now—Obama has refused to release his name change records, adoption records, records of his and his mother’s repatriation as U.S. citizens from Indonesia, baptism records, Noelani Elementary School records, Punahou School financial aid or school records, Occidental College financial aid records, Harvard Law School records, Columbia senior thesis, record with Illinois State Bar Association, files from his terms as an Illinois state senator, his law client list, medical records and passport records. He has also suppressed the marriage license of his parents. His backdated [Selective Service form](#) remains unexplained.

Nor was a valid explanation ever provided for his [false Massachusetts Social Security Number](#), despite the ostensible “fact-checking” by [Snopes](#) and its shady investigator [Kim Lacapria](#), actually an effort by the husband-and-wife [anti-conservative site](#) to exculpate Obama. (Odd that the Mikkelson couple, now divorced, should have chosen the name. The Snopes family, featured in William Faulkner’s [Yoknapatawpha novel cycle](#), represents the dregs of humanity.)

When the White House released the long form digital copy of Obama’s birth certificate on April 27, 2011, I immediately suspected it to be in some way defective, an ostensible facsimile of an original that had *never been publicly viewed*. Former policy advisor to Margaret Thatcher Lord Christopher Moncton, after a minute analysis of the document (and the long list of surrounding incongruities in Obama’s career) and the application of probability theory, wryly hedged his bets, claiming in his [affidavit](#), *sworn under oath and penalty of perjury*, that the odds of the birth certificate being genuine were “vanishingly different from zero,” that is, “on the order of 1 in 75 sextillion.”

Interestingly, in my own country of Canada, a digital copy like Obama’s would be rejected outright as not constituting [proof of citizenship](#). The issue is not that a hypothetically

photoshopped president was born outside the U.S.—although the possibility cannot be dismissed—only that the birth certificate was deeply problematic and quite conceivably fraudulent. *The crux of the matter is not nativity but documentation.*

Former Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio, whose Cold Case Posse investigated the birth certificate, recently said as much and more in an [interview](#) with CNN's Jake Tapper: "I don't care where [Obama] was born. I'm talking about a fraudulent government certificate, a birth certificate. That's all I'm concerned with." For years, almost no one wanted to touch the issue—too dangerous, too incendiary. Yet anyone who looks at the document without anterior convictions, or has it impartially analyzed, should know the facsimile released by the White House should not be taken at face value, not because of a few "glitches in some of the printing," as Tapper alleged, but on far too many counts to dismiss.

The many discrepancies and anomalies found in the LFBC (Long Form Birth Certificate) released by the White House include a chain of custody entailing the distribution of separate "data layers" uncharacteristic of a scanned paper document (more on this later); unnaturally irregular letter, word, line spacing and alignment blemishes inconsistent with the manual typewriter on which the original would have been typed; the problematic "[halo effect](#)," (a sign of manipulation); the absence of "chromatic aberration" that should appear on documents that have come into contact with a camera lens; the out-of-sequence certificate number; the appearance of the word "African" as a race designator twenty eight years before it came into official use; and various anomalous coding practices, among many other irregularities.

Arpaio—against whom, incidentally, the Obama DoJ threatened to [file contempt of court charges](#) for defying orders to keep the southern border open to illegals—began his investigation with a null hypothesis, that is, the assumption that the document

is authentic. But if the deviation is alarmingly large, the null hypothesis becomes unacceptable, as was the case with Arpaio's examination of the digital facsimile.

Additionally, Arpaio's lead investigator Mike Zullo has discovered [nine points of forgery](#)—i.e., of identity—between the Obama document and the birth certificate of a certain Johanna Ah'nee, “the source document from which the Obama LFBC was created.” Birth announcements in newspapers, a fact cited by Obama loyalists, mean nothing; they can be paid for and inserted by anyone who wishes. Crucially, the Hawaii Department of Health has not released Obama's original 1961 birth records, *which would have made the whole problem vanish on the instant*—this in itself a smoking gun.

The typical argument put forward by Alex Koppelman in a December 2008 [Salon](#) article that releasing the original would only “stoke[] the fever of conspiracy mongers”—“Whatever can't be ignored can be twisted to fit into the narrative; every new disclosure of something that should, by rights, end the controversy only opens up new questions, identifies new plotters”—is so risibly disingenuous, so obvious a ploy to avoid confronting unwelcome information, that it scarcely requires rebuttal. To fail to produce evidence of authenticity merely because some might misuse it looks like a pretty slender pretext to cover lack of evidence. There are times when excuses serve only to raise suspicion.

The PDF Dilemma and other Implausibles

Many savants have attested that the computer generated birth certificate is indeed genuine. Most of these anti-skeptics prefer to focus on the so-called pdf layering problem rather than on the profusion of blemishes that mar the document. It seems to them to be the line of least resistance to buttress their claim of authenticity. But here, too, the issue is profoundly troubled.

Obama supporters have circled the wagons. According to [FoxNews Politics](#), for example, specialist Jean-Claude Tremblay, referring to the oddly built-up, multi-layered nature of the document, “said the layers cited by doubters are evidence of the use of common, off-the-shelf scanning software—not evidence of a forgery.” Why a team of computer experts hired by the president of the United States would use off-the-shelf software is a question left unanswered. To take another instance from a myriad, Nathan Goulding writing in the [National Review](#) suggested “that whoever scanned the birth certificate in Hawaii forgot to turn off the [OCR setting](#) on the scanner.” This explanation is too thin to be acceptable. Luckily, Goulding later discovered in an update that the complexity of the operation creates the identical components found in the document. “Try it at home,” Goulding recommends, providing a recipe for the process.

The experts I’ve read and consulted are unanimous that this cannot account for the many levels of overlay. Former senior technical advisor to the Canadian government and a consummate professional in the field [Ted Paull](#) performed Goulding’s “home test” at my request and wrote up a report detailing the stage by stage operation, which concludes: “I would postulate a much more likely explanation, i.e., the long form had to be assembled in an editing program capable of creating separate layers. Once completed it was then saved as a pdf, with the layers intact, i.e. uncompressed into one layer, leaving it further editable as a pdf. I can verify that there is no doubt that the birth certificate was constructed in many separate layers, likely in Adobe Illustrator, which were not ‘compressed’ into one layer before being saved as a pdf. It’s a fake.”

Among a plethora of competent doubters, one commentator to the [FoxNews](#) article with obvious forensic skills writes: “I have pulled the long form pdf apart as well. There is evidence of overprint or transparency effects having been applied to the

text layers. I placed a black vector layer between the background layer and the text layers. The text changes from black to green when black is placed behind it. This implies that an overprint or transparency effect was applied to the text images at some point. A scanner would not do this. Neither would optimization. Optimization or saving the file through preview could render the effect undiscernable through adobe illustrator tools like the transparency panel or the attributes panel, but when you place a black layer behind it, you can still see the effect. This also strongly suggests the file had been tampered with." For reasons of space I have cited only two credible witnesses; the list is extensive.

The Plot Thickens

According to Jerome Corsi's definitive and exhaustive account, [Where's the Birth Certificate?](#), Hawaii governor Neil Abercrombie has admitted that "a long-form, hospital-generated birth certificate for Barack Obama may not exist within the vital records maintained by the Hawaii Department of Health." Naturally, Corsi has been pilloried as a crank, especially by those who cannot [distinguish between](#) an actual birth certificate and a digital copy. Far more damning, the search for the original was stymied by Obama's first [Executive Order \(13489\)](#) on January 21, 2009. There can be only two, often reciprocal, reasons to sequester one's papers: to hide what is there or to hide what isn't. If anyone can furnish a third reason, I would appreciate being notified. Indeed, the case that something fugitive is going on is so open-and-shut only a *real* conspiracy of silence or a collective psychic lobotomy could explain ignoring it.

This lengthy scroll of gaps, incongruities, errors, discrepancies and oddities is truly inexcusable. It is not even understandable. Still, diehard liberals and timorous conservatives shrug off the obvious and ridicule those who point to a scantily-clothed emperor as fanatics. Such myopia is shocking. CNN's po-faced [Don Lemon](#) asked how Trump would

like being called a “fake president,” but, as they say, he got the wrong guy. For all we know, Obama may have been born in [Mother’s Rest](#). That doesn’t change the near certainty that the birth certificate released by the White House is akin to Monopoly Money.

Pro forma, Obama lawyer Alexandra Hill [stated in a New Jersey court](#) (skip to the 34-45 minute mark in the embedded video) that the digital “image” is irrelevant to Obama’s placement on the ballot. This is very convenient. Additionally, Reed Hayes, who has served as an expert for Perkins Coie, the law firm that has defended Obama in eligibility cases, and who sits on the board of the [Scientific Association of Forensic Examiners](#), [has stated](#): “based on my observations and findings, it is clear that the Certificate of Live Birth I examined is not a scan of an original paper birth certificate, but a digitally manufactured document created by utilizing material from various sources.”

In an article titled [“We Need a Law to Prevent Another President Obama,”](#) Mark Hewitt critiques Obama’s eligibility for the office of the Presidency by focusing neither on the birth certificate controversy nor on the place of birth issue, but on the question of how the *son of a Kenyan national* could become President of the United States. He cogently argues that the Constitutional phrase “natural born citizen” means, as the Founders intended, “born of two American parents,” *in order to avoid the dilemma of dual citizenship and split allegiance*. This observation makes perfect sense. The President cannot owe loyalty to another country. Indeed, nothing could be more obvious, yet few ever assimilated what is palpably undeniable. Hewitt concludes, therefore, that under the auspices and provisions of Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution, Obama plainly did not satisfy the eligibility requirements for the Presidency. The argument underscores the ambiguity of Obama’s qualifications for the highest office in the land.

All these shadows on Obama’s legitimacy, however, were swept

aside by an ever-[compliant media](#) and studiously ignored by Congress, and those who brought attention to the scandal were duly mocked. The fear of media and punditocratic repercussions has had its effect.

The Confidence Man: His Masquerade

For eight years, we resembled the “sophomore” in Herman Melville’s [last novel](#), fascinated by the confidence man’s siren appeal, “Could you now...by way of experiment, simply have confidence in me?” But unlike the infatuate, we were unable to “abruptly retire[] from the spot” and leave the charlatan “to wander away in the opposite direction.”

As I’ve noted, there is a heavy cost to be borne for questioning presidential authenticity *if that president happens to be Barack Obama*. Any other president, especially if he’s Donald Trump, is fair game. Obama, however, is an untouchable, and the penalty for doubting his status and integrity ranges from public derision to career suicide to criminal proceedings.

Lt. Colonel Terry Lakin should know. A decorated Army flight surgeon who questioned whether his deployment orders were legitimate on the grounds that his Commander-in-Chief’s birth certificate was not provably authentic, Lakin was court-martialed, manacled and shackled, imprisoned for six months, and drummed out of the Army without pay, pension and benefits. “What I do not understand,” he wrote in his book [Officer’s Oath: Why My Vow to Defend the Constitution Demanded that I Sacrifice My Career](#), “is why Obama did not just come forward with his key documents and be done with it. Instead, he ordered all his important records to be kept under seal.” Lakin points out what we all know and as I mentioned above, namely that *a digital scan is not an official document and would not be sufficient as evidence in court*. He himself was required by deployment order to produce five copies of his birth certificate, “but the president did not need one to

order my deployment. This was nuts.” What is more, to reiterate, *even if the digital certificate were not a forgery, it would still be inadmissible as an official document.*

Conservatives, Republicans and others do not want to press the matter for they are terrified of being derided by the media and the sanctimonious punditry as “birthers” or smeared as bigots and racists. Nor do they relish being accused of opening a Pandora’s Box of “evils,” igniting racial conflict and dividing the nation by bringing suit on so volatile an issue. But fear is not a morally justifiable reason for cowardice and the country is already more divided and [racially fractured](#), thanks to Obama, than it has ever been in the modern era.

Many members of the legislative branch, both Democrats and Republicans, are doubtlessly aware that the birth certificate is almost certifiably a forgery—in fact, aside from the layering effect, the manifold disparities therein are more than enough to discredit it—and are cognizant of Obama’s problematic history and subliminal biography. But, like defending soccer players during a [free kick](#), they are carefully protecting their privates. The matter will not conveniently go away; it will form a particularly infamous chapter in the chronicles of the nation and the stigma will remain for generations, unless some form of restitution is forthcoming. Those who have decided to let the matter go will be judged complicit. Is America so far gone that it cannot even begin to acknowledge two seismic political truths: that the Democratic Party, as Dinesh D’Souza has shown in [documentary](#) and [book](#), is the greatest shakedown outfit in the history of the United States, and that Barack Obama may be its greatest con artist?

The Trouble with Barry

The trouble with Barry, like Hitchcock’s moribund [Harry](#), is that he never seems to go away, constantly popping up at the

most inopportune moments. The [Washington Examiner](#) would like to see Obama “go quietly into the night,” as no doubt many people would, to prevent “any post-presidential meddling.” But unlike most previous presidents, Obama has refused to leave quietly and intends to continue his fealty to Alinsky-style “community organizing” and to stirring up resistance to a Trump administration. There is no question of a period of grace or diminishment of vitriol; the “[venerable American tradition](#)” of the presidential honeymoon is not in the cards. One way or another, we are in for tempestuous times.

According to the [New York Post](#), Obama has installed a “shadow government” with an army of more than 30,000 agitators whose purpose is “to sabotage the incoming administration.” “You’re going to see me early next year,” he told his troops post-election, “and we’re going to be in a position where we can start cooking up all kinds of great stuff.” His Organization for Action (OFA) is swimming in cash and has over 250 offices across the country.

In a salient [article](#) for *American Thinker*, Shari Goodman asks why the [Seditious Conspiracy Act](#) is not invoked against the mutinous actions of George Soros who “has given away billions to 187 organizations dedicated to destroying the United States from within,” and who is bankrolling the Obama “resistance.” Similarly, I am asking why Obama has so far evaded impeachment. A responsible DoJ would open a file on Obama immediately, on [multiple grounds](#) of malfeasance. Of course, he would then become a martyr to his confederates in Party and Press and to his deluded minions. Better a martyr than an agent of destruction.

Failing to act on the “Obama file” would constitute an indelible stain on the American justice system, already deeply compromised under the corrupt stewardship of Obama’s lieutenants Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch. The reluctance to prosecute would amount to a signal dereliction of duty, a willingness to allow the judicial process to be hijacked by

the very politicians and legislators sworn to uphold it. Technically, such negligence could itself be tantamount to a crime—call it [reckless indifference](#), [collusion](#) or [criminal facilitation](#).

No less critically, it is not only the justice system but the presidency itself that would be irrevocably damaged. “Years of lying presidents—Democrat Lyndon Johnson and Republican Richard Nixon, especially”—writes Thomas Sowell in his farewell [syndicated column](#), “destroyed not only their own credibility, but the credibility which the office itself confers.” A decent president, a man with patriotic feelings, a penchant for [decisive action](#) and a sense of commitment to the task of salvaging the republic, could go some way toward restoring confidence in the office of the presidency for mainstream America—but it would first need to be purged of the desecration and befoulment that are Obama’s true legacy. The impeachment of Obama would give proof through the night of Obama’s vexed and destructive presidency that “our flag was still there.” There should be no reluctance to pursue a manifestly legitimate issue involving a former president who has lied consistently during his time in office and floated an unconvincing birth certificate. There should be no falling off in undertaking a just agenda.

We may also consider yet another option, to wit, the issuing of an executive order (used so freely by Obama, thus setting a precedent) to compel Hawaiian officials to release the putatively original document, which should settle the matter definitively. But I have a hunch, as Governor Abercrombie has suggested, that the matter may already have been decided.

At the same time, all of Obama’s sealed records should be made available to the public in the national interest. This might be done under the auspices of national security, in order to ensure that such a miscarriage of political justice never occur again. Obama is part of the swamp that must be drained, perhaps the deepest part, and must be called out for his

serial deceptions. Yet Obama is not totally responsible for his miscreant conduct. Americans let him get away with it, the political version of busted coverage. The question is whether Americans will continue letting him get away with it.

The issue is too vastly significant to be passed over. This is a case in which justice must be *conspicuously* served, despite the consensual depravity of the left and the progressivist hordes that care not a whit for justice, decency and the American Constitution. For it is not enough to say "In God we trust"; we must also trust His deputies and emissaries.