

## Dear Mr. O'Reilly

Your purported "no spin zone" was nothing but spin when you discussed the \$20,000 fine Judge Land levied against attorney Orly Taitz. You and your guests made statements that were *not* true, and you neglected to mention significant points that would be important to the average viewer. Fox News Channel's "We report, you decide" motto is meaningless if you distort a few facts and omit the rest.

You have clearly "gone soft" on Obama (as have Shepard Smith and a few others on Fox). Even Glenn Beck, who at least dares to go after Obama's Marxism, stays away from the natural born citizen issue. Who got to you "folks?" Who has ordered you to avoid the issue of Obama's eligibility, unless you can use it to ridicule his opponents?

The facts:

1. Obama's long form birth certificate has *not* been made public. No one has seen it.
2. *No* court has ruled that Obama is a natural born citizen. *No* court has ruled that Obama was born in Hawaii. All of the Obama eligibility lawsuits are either pending or have been dismissed due to lack of standing or because of jurisdictional grounds. *No* case has been judged on the basis of merits... just technicalities. In other words, no judge has had the courage to address the main constitutional issue: "What does the U.S. Constitution mean by the term natural born citizen, and how must candidates prove they meet the requirements to serve?"
3. Although Judge Land dismissed one of Dr. Taitz's lawsuits, she has another case that has *not* been dismissed and which has been *scheduled for trial* on January 26, 2010. Is that not relevant? Are not your viewers entitled to know about that upcoming trial? Needless to say, if George W. Bush had been the subject of a similar lawsuit the media would be all over it, 24 hours per day. Why does Obama get a pass? Do Democrats not have to follow the U.S. Constitution?
4. The short form certificate of live birth (COLB) that was posted on the Internet is believed to be a forgery. Even if it is not, your attorney guests Lis Wiehl and Kimberly Guilfoyle should know that a computer image of a document would *not* be accepted in a court of law as evidence if the actual paper document exists and could be produced in its place. (Even non-lawyers understand that.)
5. At the time of Obama's birth, Hawaii provided birth certificates to infants born *outside* of Hawaii as long as the two parents had been residents of Hawaii for at least one year. Therefore, having a Hawaiian birth certificate proves nothing. Obama's half-sister, Maya Soetoro-Ng, has a Hawaiian birth certificate even though she was born in Indonesia. You and your guests did not mention that. Why?
6. Obama has spent a small fortune (of someone's money, not necessarily his) to fight legal challenges about his eligibility to serve as president. That tremendous expense

could be avoided with the simple release of his long form birth certificate and his school records. Why spend over one million dollars to fight lawsuits when a payment of perhaps \$12 can resolve the issue?

7. I have been in contact with a former classmate and friend of Barack Hussein Obama, Sr., and that contact believes the father of Obama was not the Kenyan student. (Hiding the identity of his real father may be the reason Obama will not release his long form birth certificate or school records.) I am sure there are other such person out there. Why did the media not seek them out for interviews during the campaign?

8. Contemporaneous writings of the Founding Fathers indicate they defined "natural born citizen" as a person born on U.S. soil to two U.S. citizen parents. Because Obama's father was *not* a U.S. citizen (assuming his father was Obama, Sr.), Obama is *not* a natural born citizen - *regardless* of where he was born. (Your attorney guests, Wiehl and Guilfoyle, might want to do some research before making judgments about cases they have likely not read. I suggest they read *The Law of Nations* and the cases *Shanks v. Dupont*, *Minor v. Happersett*, *United States v. Ward*, *United States v. Wong Kim Ark*, and *Keith v. United States*.)

9. Obama was, according to his half-sister, adopted by Indonesian Lolo Soetoro when his mother remarried. If that was the case, Obama became a citizen of Indonesia, which does *not* allow dual citizenship. If Obama applied for U.S. citizenship when he returned to the United States in or about 1970, he should release his naturalization papers. He refuses to do so. He is also keeping his passport records secret, possibly because they show that his 1981 trip to Pakistan, India, and Indonesia was mad with his Indonesian passport. (I suspect he never applied for U.S. citizenship after he moved back to the United States, and remains a citizen of Indonesia to this day.)

10. Records show that Obama has used more than one Social Security number, and the one he is currently using was assigned in Connecticut; it was originally assigned to a man who was born in 1890. Obama neither lived nor worked in Connecticut. Why then does he have a Social Security number issued in that state? Why is he using a dead person's Social Security number? (The numbers are *not* reassigned after a person's death.) Fraud is the most likely explanation. And if the reason is fraud, it may be because Obama was not an American citizen eligible to obtain a Social Security number legitimately. Like many non-citizens, he simply used the number of a dead American.

11. Americans who are suspicious of Obama's past are not crazy, as you and your guests implied. They simply believe that someone who has shrouded his life in secrecy must have a reason for doing so, and we would like answers.

12. Anyone who has studied Obama's life - as I have - would have serious doubts about not just his legitimacy, but his integrity and honesty. The job of the media is to be skeptical of government officials in order to keep them honest, not whitewash the truth to protect them. I took it upon myself to write a book, *The Obama Timeline*, to prove to the nation that Obama is a fraud. *I would not have had to devote 4,000 hours to that project*

*had the media done its job properly.*

Your having implied that Captain Barnett is a coward is contemptuous. She has served in the U.S military (as have I), which is more than many politicians and media members have done. She deserves an apology from you... as does attorney Taitz.

If you do not take seriously those who doubt Obama's eligibility to serve, you are free to ignore the issue. You did not have to bring up the case on your program. That you mentioned it *without* giving attorney Taitz the opportunity to defend her position is reprehensible. Either allow the other side to state her case - or don't bring up the issue in the first place. Your segment was clearly meant only to ridicule people, *not* to have an objective discussion of the facts. Shame on you. If I want to watch someone being ridiculed without an opportunity for a defense, I can watch Bill Maher, John Daly, Keith Olbermann, and Chris Matthews.

I challenge you to invite Captain Barnett, Orly Taitz, and even me to your program and allow us an extended period of time to make our case against the current temporary resident of the oval office. To deny us that privilege means only one of two things: you are a fraud and have no allegiance to your self-described "no spin zone," or you have executives carefully controlling what you can say. If it is the case of the former, I shall no longer watch your program. If it is the case of the latter, I shall no longer watch the Fox News Channel.

*Don Fredrick*

*Author, The Obama Timeline*

*[www.colony14.net](http://www.colony14.net)*