

FREDERICK WILLIAM DAME

## IMPEACH! CONVICT! SENTENCE!



"Impeachment is one of the three ways the *Constitution* reins in executive lawlessness; the others – elections, and the power of the purse – no longer perform this function as (the Founding Fathers) originally envisioned." – Andrew C. McCarthy<sup>1</sup>

### 1. PROPOSITION

For the continued existence of the *Constitution for the United States of America* and the rights, privileges, and duties contained therein, it is necessary that Barack Hussein Obama be impeached, convicted, and sentenced as a traitor. Because impeachment is a political process and not a legal procedure it is absolutely necessary for the public to have the will and exercise its will to remove Barack Hussein Obama from office. It is not a question of whether or not impeachable offenses can be proven. Barack Hussein Obama must be found guilty and undergo sentencing. In the case of Barack Hussein Obama, the maxim *innocent until proven guilty* is not an important matter because Barack Hussein Obama has shown his guilt in all of his lawless actions.

Article I, Section 3, Clause 7 of the *Constitution for the United States of America*<sup>2</sup> states:

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrew C. McCarthy, *Faithless Execution Building the Political Case for Obama's Impeachment*, Encounter Books, New York: 2014, p. vi.

<sup>2</sup> This is the true title of the document even though some places in the *Constitution* have of instead of for. Read the presentation of the truth behind the logic of this title at <http://www.thecompleteobamatimeline.com/uploads/3/5/7/4/3574872/theconstitutionfortheunitedstatesofamerica.pdf>.

"Judgment in Cases of Impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from Office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States: but the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law."

Further, Article II, Section 4 states:

"The President, Vice President and all civil Officers of the United States, shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors."

Once these standards for impeachment have been met and Barack Hussein Obama has been impeached and found guilty, Barack Hussein Obama can be indicted for his crimes and be punished according to law. However, because Barack Hussein Obama is the present, illegal occupier of the Oval Office, impeachment is the first action that must be taken to insure protection against presidential lawlessness, now and in the future.<sup>3</sup>

## 2. IMPEACHMENT: AN ETYMOLOGICAL FOUNDATION

The term *Impeachment* is the noun form of the verb *impeach*. *Impeach* means

1. to charge with malfeasance in office before a proper tribunal.
2. to challenge or discredit; to attack; to degrade."<sup>4</sup>

The word comes from the Indoeuropean word root **ped**<sup>1</sup>, meaning *foot* with the extended zero grade form *\*pōd*,<sup>5</sup> in Germanic *fōt*, in Old English *fōt*, both meaning

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.heritage.org/constitution/#!/articles/1/essays/18/punishment-for-impeachment> has an elaborate commentary by Professor Michael J. Gerhardt, Samuel Ashe Distinguished Professor in Constitutional Law Director, Center for Law and Government The College of William and Mary, Marshall-Wythe School of Law. Professor Gerhardt also discusses the role of censure and criminal proceedings regarding impeachment.

<sup>4</sup> *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, Houghton, Mifflin Company, Boston: 1976.

*foot*. The word root appears in the Latin word *impedire*, meaning *to put in fetters, to hobble, to shackle, to hinder*, in having become im. There is a suffixed form *\*ped-ikā*, in Latin *pedica*, meaning *fetter, snare*, from which we have the English word *impeach*.<sup>6</sup>

The first use of the word *empechen* (*to accuse or hinder*) and its associated spellings and grammatical uses is recorded in *Tracts and Treatises of John de Wycliffe* (1330-1384), first published in 1844.<sup>7</sup> Therein it is recorded that Wycliffe uses *impeaching* one time; *impeached* one time; *impeachment* one time; and *impeach* four times. They are all in reference to the possibility of accusing and charging clerics with a crime, even the Pope.<sup>8</sup> Already before 1387, the Cornish writer and translator John Trevisa (1342-1402) used the word *empêchement* as it came from the Old French *empêchement* as derived from *empêchier*, meaning *to hinder*, in his translation of *Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden monachi Cestrensis*.<sup>9</sup>

The use of *impeachment* as a judicial method to remove a public official dates from the 1640s. *Impeachment* with the sense of *to "accuse a public officer of misconduct"* is first recorded in the 1560s, most probably 1568, but perhaps this was via confusion with Latin *impetere* meaning *to attack, to accuse*. The spelling *impeach* replaced the original em-spelling sporadically throughout the 1500s.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> The asterisk means that the word has been re-created by etymological linguists.

<sup>6</sup> Julius Pokorny, *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Franke Verlag, Tübingen und Basel: 2005, p. 79 entry 2. **pěd-**, **pőd-**.

<sup>7</sup> [http://lollardsociety.org/pdfs/Vaughan\\_TractsTreatisesWyclif.pdf](http://lollardsociety.org/pdfs/Vaughan_TractsTreatisesWyclif.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> John Wycliffe, *Tracts and Treatises of John de Wycliffe* [1845], at <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/1838>. Compare with the related information at <http://www.finedictionary.com/impeach.html> and <http://law.academic.ru/1714/impeach>.

<sup>9</sup> <https://archive.org/details/polychroniconra00lumbgoog>.

<sup>10</sup> See [http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed\\_in\\_frame=0&search=impeach&searchmode=none](http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=impeach&searchmode=none) and Robert K. Barnhardt, editor. *Chambers Dictionary of Etymology*, Chambers Harap Publishers Limited, Edinburgh: 2008.

This essay is concerned with the judicial method to remove a public figure from office. The public figure is Barack Hussein Obama. He is the antithesis of the qualifications the American Founding Fathers established in order to become President.

### 3. DISCUSSION

If one googles *impeach obama* there will be 937,000 hits including some repetitions. Over the past seven years, the putative occupier of the Oval Office, Barack Hussein Obama, has engaged in numerous activities that clearly rise to the level of “high crimes and misdemeanors,” and America's elected officials in Congress have a responsibility to their constituents and to the entire nation to draw up articles of impeachment against Barack Hussein Obama.

As the United States of America has seen its principles slowly eroded by politicians with ever-increasing power, the very foundations of this great country are being worn away. It is time to act against the usurper!

The *Constitution for the United States of America* establishes a government of WE the People, by WE the People, and for WE the People, and it is this document that gives WE the People the power and above all, the responsibility to remove from office a President who does not live up to his oath of office. In order to preserve the principles in the *Constitution* and to secure the future of the American nation it is imperative that Congress move to impeach Barack Hussein Obama. Let us now lay out the case against the usurper and make it clear that Barack Hussein Obama must be removed from office.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> This author does not capitalize the word president when it is used in reference to Barack Hussein Obama because he is in that position illegally and because he has discredited the office and drawn it into his cloaca of politics. The reader will immediately recognize that this author considers Barack Hussein Obama to be an illegal president and as such must be legally and physically removed from office. The logical argumentation for this position will be presented below.

### 3.1 BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW: THE IMPEACHMENT PROCESS

Article II, Section 4 of the *Constitution for the United States of America* states that "The President, Vice President, and all civil Officers of the United States shall be removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes and Misdemeanors."<sup>12</sup> There are a variety of specific processes involved in impeaching officials at various levels of government. For the purposes of this discussion we will focus solely on those specific rules that pertain to the impeachment of a sitting United States President.

Impeachment is a two-fold process. It begins in the House of Representatives. If and when a President is accused of one or more impeachable offenses, it is the responsibility of the members of the House of Representatives to draw up articles of impeachment. These articles are analogous to the charging and indictment of a defendant in a criminal court. They largely serve as a formal list of the charges against the President. Any member of the House can call for an impeachment of the President and can set forth an informal list of charges (or proposed charges). In contemporary times the impeachment process has been formalized to the extent that it is the responsibility of the House Judiciary Committee to determine whether the process will move forward. If it is believed that the President has committed one or more impeachable offenses, the Committee will present a resolution to that effect. At such time as a resolution is passed, it is then sent to the House Chamber for debate and voting. In other words, the Judiciary Committee determines whether grounds for impeachment exist, while the entire House of Representatives must then vote on whether to move the process forward based on the findings of the Judiciary Committee. If the House of Representatives votes to impeach, it draws up formal articles of impeachment which are then sent to the Senate.

---

<sup>12</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article\\_Two\\_of\\_the\\_United\\_States\\_Constitution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article_Two_of_the_United_States_Constitution). The fact that the title of this Wikipedia article is as it is indicates that Wikipedia considers that the American *Constitution* belongs to the United States. The document does not belong to the United States. The document belongs to WE the People!

If the House of Representatives can be seen as analogous to an arraignment court where impeachment is concerned, then the Senate is analogous to the criminal court in which the actual trial takes place. It is not the responsibility of the Senate to decide whether the President should be subject to impeachment proceedings. Once the Senate receives formal articles of impeachment from the House of Representatives, the Senate has a duty to move forward with the impeachment trial. It cannot demand that a trial not be conducted. In the case of sitting Presidents and Vice Presidents, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court serves as the presiding judge. In the first phase of an impeachment trial the Senate Trial Committee hears the list of charges and evidence against the President and then prepares a report and recommendation for review by the Senators. Once the evidence has been reviewed and the Senate Trial Committee has issued its report and recommendations, the members of the Senate fulfill the role of the jury and vote to convict or acquit at the end of the trial.

In the history of the United States of America only two Presidents have been impeached: Andrew Johnson (1808-1875; President 1865-1869) in 1868 and William Jefferson Clinton (1946 - ; President 1993-2001) in 1998. In both instances the Presidents were acquitted during their impeachment trials. While some Americans may have felt that the two Presidents should not have been acquitted, the results have demonstrated that the process is as fair as possible, and allows for a public airing and discussion of grievances related to presidential conduct in office. A third United States President, Richard M. Nixon (1913-1994; President 1969-1974) was subject to articles of Impeachment by the House of Representatives, but he chose to resign from office before his impeachment trial in the Senate began. As such, President Nixon is the only President who has left office as a direct result of the impeachment process and he is the only United States President to resign from Office. The fact that only three out of forty-four United States Presidents have faced impeachment demonstrates that it is not a process that has been used frivolously. On the contrary, it is considered a measure of last resort when evidence exists that a President has failed to live up to his duties according to the *Constitution for the United States of America*. As the

following sections will show, the evidence supporting the impeachment of Barack Hussein Obama is clear and compelling.

### **3.2 THE DECISION TO IMPEACH BARACK OBAMA**

Before laying out the specific acts for which Barack Hussein Obama should – no, must be impeached – it is necessary to establish the context in which these arguments are being made. There are a significant number of specific allegations, concerns, and outright accusations against Barack Hussein Obama that based on their veracity, there could be reason enough to impeach him and remove him from office. Taken together, they combine to form an airtight case for impeachment. To be completely fair and entirely transparent, however, not all of these accusations can necessarily be proven in a Senate trial. Even for those concerns about Barack Hussein Obama’s conduct as putative president that are clearly and arguably valid, it can be argued that not all of them rise to the standard of “high crimes and misdemeanors.”

In order to make a convincing argument that Barack Hussein Obama must be impeached by Congress, it is first necessary to make it clear that Barack Hussein Obama has committed acts that do, in fact, rise to the level of impeachable offenses. Because the impeachment process has been used so sparingly in the past, it is absolutely imperative to demonstrate that calling for the impeachment of Barack Hussein Obama is not simply an act of political revenge or partisan gamesmanship. The argument against Barack Hussein Obama is not being made by those who have simply not gotten their way in the political arena. It is being made by those who recognize the serious, existential threat his actions represent to the American republic, and the duty the elected representatives of WE the People have to respond to that threat.

In the *Federalist Papers*, Number 65, Alexander Hamilton (1757-1804) gave the following definition of impeachable offense:

"... those offences which proceed from the misconduct of public men, or in other words from the abuse or violation of the public trust. They are of a nature which with particular propriety be dominated political, as they relate chiefly to injuries done immediately to the society itself."<sup>13</sup>

### **3.3 MAKING THE CASE AGAINST BARACK OBAMA**

There are several, most serious charges against Barack Hussein Obama, the evidence of which presents how and why they rise to the level of impeachable offenses. Each of the charges will be examined individually. Subsequently, each charge will be considered in terms of how their combined weight has the effect of establishing a compelling argument for removing Barack Hussein Obama from office.

There are a number of grassroots organizations that have formed to lay out arguments in favor of impeachment. Literally, multiple dozens of charges have been made by such organizations and the individuals who comprise them.<sup>14</sup>

It would be difficult to discuss all of the detailing of these charges here without devoting thousands of pages to the task that would conceivably fill volumes. Therefore, only the most serious and pressing charges will be examined. The choice to focus only on several distinctive charges is in no way intended to imply that the charges not listed herein are not significant. One final note must be taken into account: these charges are discussed in no particular order. They should not be seen as being ranked by any order of importance. All of these

---

<sup>13</sup> [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/fed65.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fed65.asp).

<sup>14</sup> Consult the following Web pages: <http://www.impeachobamacampaign.com/>.  
<http://www.allenbwest.com/2014/06/case-impeachment-barack-hussein-obama/>.  
<http://www.pledgetoimpeach.com/news.php>.  
<http://www.wnd.com/2013/08/black-republicans-call-for-obama-impeachment/>.  
<http://act.theteaparty.net/10026/impeach-president-obama-remove-him-from-office/>.  
<http://www.westernjournalism.com/impeach-obama-organization-just-getting-started/>.  
<http://www.petition2congress.com/9218/we-people-demand-congress-impeach-president-obama/>.  
<https://petitions.whitehouse.gov/petition/we-request-obama-be-impeached-following-reasons>.



charges are serious. Virtually any one of them could be considered legal grounds to remove Barack Hussein Obama from office.

#### **4. THE NATURAL BORN CITIZEN REQUIREMENT, FELONIES, TREASON, AND OATH**

These are four major categories (among others) to be considered when discussing the impeachment of Barack Hussein Obama that are covered by the *Constitution for the United States of America*.

##### **4.1 THE CONSTITUTIONAL NATURAL BORN CITIZEN REQUIREMENT TO BE PRESIDENT**

In an essay titled *Why Ted Cruz Is Not A Natural Born Citizen*<sup>15</sup> and dated March 23, 2015, Don Fredrick of *The Complete Obama Timeline*, writes:

"The historical meaning of the term "natural born citizen" is *birth on U.S. soil to two U.S. citizen parents*. That was the definition understood and followed by the Founding Fathers, and the authors of the U.S. Constitution. By that definition, Cruz is ineligible to serve as president—as are (Barack Hussein) Obama, Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL), Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal, former Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA), and South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley (R).

Many claim that the 14th Amendment applies to Cruz, but the 14th Amendment *never even uses the term natural born citizen!* One cannot magically pretend that any time the generic word "citizen" is used in the Constitution, its Amendments, or federal legislation that it automatically *also means natural born citizen*. It does not. Any first year law student would receive a failing grade from his professor if he made such an argument.<sup>16</sup> Claiming that the word *citizen* in legislation also means "natural born citizen" is as wrong-headed as claiming that wherever a city ordinance uses the term "automobile" it also means *truck* or *motorcycle*. *Words have meanings*.

---

<sup>15</sup> [http://thecompleteobamatimeline.com/uploads/3/5/7/4/3574872/whytetedcruzis\\_notanaturalborncitizen.pdf](http://thecompleteobamatimeline.com/uploads/3/5/7/4/3574872/whytetedcruzis_notanaturalborncitizen.pdf). See also <http://thecompleteobamatimeline.com/uploads/3/5/7/4/3574872/whyobamaisineligibleregardless.pdf> and <http://thecompleteobamatimeline.com/uploads/3/5/7/4/3574872/reportonnaturalborncitizenfraud.pdf>.

<sup>16</sup> This author's comment: except for Barack Hussein Obama at Harvard University.

Others note that federal law confers citizenship on persons born *outside* the United States, if both parents are U.S. citizens or if at least one citizen parent has resided in the United States for at least five years after age 14. But that law *only* confers *generic* U.S. citizenship. It does *not* state that such person would also be a *natural born citizen*. ...

Congressman John Bingham—*who authored that amendment*—said on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1862,

“All from other lands, who by the terms of laws and a compliance with their provisions become naturalized, are adopted citizens of the United States; all other persons born within the Republic, *of parents owing allegiance to no other sovereignty* [italics added], are natural born citizens.”

***Read that again and let it sink in.*** In 1862, the members of Congress understood that a natural born citizen was someone born on U.S. soil to two U.S. citizen parents. Let it also sink in that no law has been passed since then to change the meaning of the term, nor has there been an amendment to the U.S. Constitution with regard to that issue.

In 1866 Bingham stated, “Every human being born within the jurisdiction of the United States *of parents not owing allegiance to any foreign sovereignty* [italics added] is, in the language of your Constitution itself, a natural born citizen.” Obama supporters—including attorneys filing briefs with the U.S. Supreme Court—have intentionally *omitted* the words *of parents* when quoting Bingham’s statement, in a shameful effort to mislead. Ask yourself, “Why would Obama-supporting attorneys have thought it might help their client if they omitted the words ‘of parents?’” ...

In the 1885 U.S. Supreme Court case *Minor v. Happersett*, Chief Justice Morrison Waite wrote,

“The Constitution does not, in words, say who shall be natural-born citizens. Resort must be had elsewhere to ascertain that. At common-law, with the nomenclature of which the framers of the Constitution were familiar, it was never doubted that all children born in a country *of parents who*

*were its citizens* [italics added] became themselves, upon their birth, citizens also. These were natives, or natural-born citizens, as distinguished from aliens or foreigners. Some authorities go further and include as citizens children born within the jurisdiction without reference to the citizenship of their parents. As to this class there have been doubts, but never as to the first.” That is, there was agreement by all legal scholars in 1885 that the term natural born citizen meant “born in the United States to two U.S.-citizen parents.” ...

The Supreme Court has never ruled on the meaning of the term natural born citizen. It certainly had the *opportunity* to do so with the Obama eligibility challenge lawsuit *Kerchner v. Obama*, but the Justices declined to accept the case for review. One must ask *why* the court was afraid to accept the case for review if it would have put the issue to rest once and for all. The answer is that the court knew it would have to rule *against* Obama, and it was reluctant to do so—because it might have resulted in nationwide race riots.<sup>17</sup> Because the Court chose not to hear *Kerchner*, the issue is again rearing its ugly head for Cruz (and perhaps for Rubio, Santorum, Jindal, and Haley if they enter the race).

Those who think they understand the issue should take a moment to read the actual presidential eligibility rule. Article II, Section 1, Clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution reads:

“No Person except a natural born Citizen, *or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution* [italics added], shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.”

---

<sup>17</sup> The present author's note: Not hearing the case and therefore declining to make judgment against Barack Hussein Obama meant that the justices of the United States Supreme court surrendered justice and the rule of law and capitulated to the to the mob supporting Barack Hussein Obama..

Note the italicized *grandfather clause*. That text was made necessary after the term “born citizen” was changed to read *natural born citizen*. An *earlier* draft of the document read as follows:

“No Person except a Born Citizen shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.”

*Born Citizen* simply means born on U.S. soil—*without* regard to the citizenship of one’s parents. John Jay then wrote George Washington and asked that all presidents be required to be *natural born* citizens—that is, born on U.S. soil to two U.S. citizen parents. But simply making that change (*born* to *natural born*) would have been inadequate:

“No Person except a natural born Citizen shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.”

Why would that text be insufficient? The problem with that text was that neither George Washington nor John Adams (nor anyone else) was a natural born citizen! Those potential presidents age 35 or older who were born on U.S. soil (such as George Washington, who was born in Virginia) obviously could not have had U.S. citizen parents at the time of their births—because the nation did not yet exist. (Washington’s parents were citizens of Great Britain, as were the majority of the residents of the 13 colonies). In other words, it would be 35 years before anyone could serve as president! To allow for that problem, the *final* version read:

“No Person except a natural born Citizen, *or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution* [italics added], shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and

been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.”

The italicized *grandfather clause* is essentially a *loophole* that means, “*We can’t go without a president for decades while we wait for natural born citizens to reach age 35, so we will temporarily allow individuals who are not natural born citizens to serve as president, as long as they were present here in the colonies and became U.S. citizens in 1776 when the nation was founded.*” Considering all of the above, it is clear that the U.S. Constitution prohibits Obama, former Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA), Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL), Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal, South Carolina Governor Nikki Haley (R-SC), and Senator Ted Cruz (R-TX) from serving as president.

Obama is actually the nation’s *second* illegal president. (The first illegal president was Chester A. Arthur, who hid from the public the fact that his father was *not* a U.S. citizen at Chester’s birth. Arthur even went so far as to burn his father’s documents—something that would not have been necessary if his father’s citizenship was irrelevant.) Regardless of where Obama was born, his father was *not* a U.S. citizen—if one assumes his father was the drunken Kenyan communist. Obama is therefore not a natural born citizen.<sup>18</sup> (Of course, if Obama’s father was actually Frank Marshall Davis, his communist mentor in Hawaii, then Obama is a natural born citizen. Ironically, Obama’s efforts to hide the identity of his father are what caused the question of his eligibility to come up. Had he made it known from the start that Davis was his father, no one would have questioned whether he was a natural born citizen—but they would have better understood his resentment toward America, white people, Jews, Israel, and capitalism.

Although Obama is hiding his past, the GOP candidates generally have not. Marco Rubio was born in Florida to Cuban citizen parents. He *is* a U.S. citizen but he is *not* a natural born citizen. Bobby Jindal and Nikki Haley were born in the United States to Indian citizen parents. They *are* U.S. citizens but are *not* natural born citizens. Rick Santorum’s father was a citizen of Italy, and Rick is therefore only a “generic” U.S. citizen. Ted Cruz was born in Canada to an American

---

<sup>18</sup> The present author’s note: There are some theories that Barack Hussein Obama is the son of Malcolm X, born Malcolm Little (1925-1965) and also known by his Arabic name el-Hajj Malik el-Shabazz. Consult the information at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CVDI0wpyb68> and <http://giveusliberty1776.blogspot.de/2014/03/if-barack-hussein-obama-ii-is-malcolm.html>, as well as <http://pamelageller.com/2008/10/how-could-stanl.html/>.

mother and a Cuban father, and is also *not* a natural born citizen—although he *is* a U.S. citizen. (A Senator is not required to be a natural born citizen. Senators need only be citizens.)

None of this is to suggest that Cruz, Rubio, Jindal, Haley, or Santorum would not be good presidents. But the law is the law and the Constitution is the Constitution. Nowadays, of course, millions of Americans seem not to know what is *in* the Constitution, and others—including legislators and even Supreme Court Justices seem not to *care* what is in the document or that it is routinely being violated. Nevertheless, it would be nice if the pundits would at least stop lying about history. Go ahead and lobby for an amendment to change the Constitution if you want to eliminate the natural born citizen requirement, but don't insult our intelligence by changing the meaning of a historical term simply because it suits your political purposes."

In January 2015, Don Fredrick continued the fail-proof argument concerning Barack Hussein Obama's ineligibility to be a legal president.

"The problem with legal challenges has been that legislators and the courts have all been afraid to address the issue of Obama's ineligibility to serve as president. The legislators essentially tell their constituents, 'There is nothing we can do. The issue belongs in the courts,' while the judges essentially declare, 'This court has no jurisdiction over the issue and the matter must be resolved by Congress.' Before the election, some courts ruled that the eligibility lawsuits should wait until after the election, while after the election other courts ruled that the challenges should have been brought before the election. That the courts are so unwilling to address the question of the definition of the term *natural born citizen* clearly suggests they know the answer works against Obama. Why, after all, have the courts been unwilling to rule that Obama is a natural born citizen *if he truly is*? Why should the question be a *hot potato* if Obama *does* meet the eligibility requirements? That the U.S. Supreme Court was afraid to hear *Kerchner v. Obama* reveals the truth: Obama does *not* meet the requirement of birth on U.S. soil to *two* U.S. citizen parents. The sad truth is that clearly ineligible candidates can run for office if the mainstream media and the voters accept them. Contrary to what many believe, there is *no* official process for vetting presidential candidates. If Vladimir Putin decides to run for U.S. president he can do so if the media and the voters are willing to accept a forged birth certificate

claiming he was born in Louisville, rather than Leningrad, and if they do not care that he did not have two U.S. citizen parents."<sup>19</sup>

#### **4.2 COMMITTING FELONIES**

The above presentations alone are enough to prove that Barack Hussein Obama cannot be a legal president and that when he and the DemocRAT Party sanctioned his being a presidential candidate, they were disobeying the law of the land as stated in the *Constitution for the United States of America*. This is a felony and also an act of treason.

A felon is a person who commits a felony. An archaic meaning of *felon* is a person who is **evil**. Barack Hussein Obama's felons are many. Here is a list of the most important felonies committed by Barack Hussein Obama.<sup>20</sup>

#### **18 U.S.C. 371 Conspiracy to Commit Offense or to Defraud United States.**

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. If, however, the offense, the commission of which is the object of the conspiracy, is a misdemeanor only, the punishment for such conspiracy shall not exceed the maximum punishment provided for such misdemeanor."

An analysis by the United States Justice Foundation (USFJ) states that, "As in all conspiracies, there must be two or more persons working in concert to achieve an illegal act, so the president would need a co-conspirator for this statute to apply. The state of Hawaii is being very

---

<sup>19</sup>[http://thecompleteobamatimeline.com/uploads/3/5/7/4/3574872/whytעדcruzis\\_notanaturalborncitizen.pdf](http://thecompleteobamatimeline.com/uploads/3/5/7/4/3574872/whytעדcruzis_notanaturalborncitizen.pdf)

<sup>20</sup><http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pagelid=126137>.

secretive about the whereabouts or even existence of Mr. Obama's supposed birth certificate. If the officials in charge of keeping these records know of its non-existence, then they would be co-conspirators with the objective of defrauding the United States as to the citizenship status of Barack Obama. There, however, must be an 'in concert' element met, meaning that these officials are withholding the proof at the direction of Mr. Obama. Is it possible that these officials love Barack Obama so much that they are withholding these documents out of the goodness of their own hearts? Yes, possibly, however unlikely. It is reasonable to infer that the Hawaiian officials are working 'in concert' with Mr. Obama to suppress this information, since each would face both civil and criminal suits, not to mention the loss of furthering their own political goals."

#### **18 U.S.C. 911 False Personation of Citizen of the United States.**

"Whoever falsely and willfully represents himself to be a citizen of the United States shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."

The USJF analysis says: "If Mr. Obama is not a natural born citizen, then he must have other proof of United States citizenship. If he has neither of these, then as acting head of state he is holding himself out to be a citizen of the United States, and is therefore liable under this section as well."

#### **18 U.S.C. § 912 False Personation of Officer or Employee of the United States.**

"Whoever falsely assumes or pretends to be an officer or employee acting under the authority of the United States or any department, agency or officer thereof, and acts as such, or in such pretended character demands or obtains any money, paper, document, or thing of value, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."



The USFJ analysis is, "Basically this statute calls for 1) fraudulent intent, and 2) an overt act to accomplish the inducement of one giving over a thing of value. If it were found that Barack Obama was not a natural born citizen, as required by the U.S. Constitution Art. II § 1, Clause 5, he will have assumed the office of president fraudulently to obtain money (among other things) by way of his annual salary. The Supreme Court has upheld convictions for False Personations in U.S. v. Lepowitch, (63 S.Ct. 914), and Lamar v. U.S., (36 S.Ct. 535)."

### **18 U.S.C. 1542 False Statement in Application and Use of Passport.**

"Whoever willfully and knowingly makes any false statement in an application for passport with intent to induce or secure the issuance of a passport under the authority of the United States, either for his own use or the use of another, contrary to the laws regulating the issuance of passports or the rules prescribed pursuant to such laws; or Whoever willfully and knowingly uses or attempts to use, or furnishes to another for use any passport the issue of which was secured in any way by reason of any false statement—Shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 25 years (if the offense was committed to facilitate an act of international terrorism (as defined in section 2331 of this title)), 20 years (if the offense was committed to facilitate a drug trafficking crime (as defined in section 929 (a) of this title)), 10 years (in the case of the first or second such offense, if the offense was not committed to facilitate such an act of international terrorism or a drug trafficking crime), or 15 years (in the case of any other offense), or both."

The USJF analysis says: "To obtain a U.S. passport one must show a valid birth certificate or some other form of identification showing U.S. citizenship. Barack Obama would have to have furnished some sort of birth certificate or other document showing he is a citizen. Of course, even if he was not a natural born citizen, he could show naturalization or some other citizenship papers. However, if these documents are spurious, then he would be guilty pursuant to the first paragraph, and to then use his illegally obtained passport, he would also be guilty under the second paragraph as well."

### **18 U.S.C. 1621 Perjury.**

"Whoever—(1) having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, in any case in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he will testify, declare, depose, or certify truly, or that any written testimony, declaration, deposition, or certificate by him subscribed, is true, willfully and contrary to such oath states or subscribes any material matter which he does not believe to be true; or

(2) in any declaration, certificate, verification, or statement under penalty of perjury as permitted under section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, willfully subscribes as true any material matter which he does not believe to be true; is guilty of perjury and shall, except as otherwise expressly provided by law, be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. This section is applicable whether the statement or subscription is made within or without the United States."

The USJF analysis says: "Mr. Obama has taken the oath of office of POTUS, in front of Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, John Roberts, in which he promises to 'defend the Constitution'. As an illegal alien, or even a non-natural born citizen, he would be acting as an ineligible president. Furthermore, as an attorney, and a former professor of constitutional law, Barack Obama would have full knowledge of the requirements for an eligible candidate for the office of POTUS. This shows that he has willfully stated that he will and is acting contrary to his presidential oath."

### **18 U.S.C. 2388(a) Activities Affecting Armed Forces During War.**

"(a) Whoever, when the United States is at war, willfully makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies; or

Whoever, when the United States is at war, willfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States, or willfully obstructs the

recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or the United States, or attempts to do so—Shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both."

The USJF analysis says: "Intent is fully at issue here; however, President Obama made it clear during his campaign that his full intent when entering office would be to scale down the conflict with Afghanistan and Iraq, eventually leading to a full withdrawal. His statements of being a natural born citizen to obtain the office of commander in chief were in effort to interfere with the attempts by the former commander in chief's attempt at engaging the enemy in these two countries, for the purpose of national security.

In the case of *Schulze v. U.S.* (259 F. 189) Petitioner was convicted under this statute, and the question of intent was at issue. The court stated, 'It is true that in charging the offense it is unnecessary to allege the intent; the offense being one whose very definition necessarily includes intent. In such a case it is necessary only to aver in apt terms the acts done. The intent will be inferred. The charge is not unlike that of treason, the indictment for which needs go no further than to follow the language of the statute which defines the offense. (*United States v. Greathouse*, 2 Abb.U.S. 364, Fed. Cas. No. 15,254)...

### **4.3 TREASON**

In essence Barack Hussein Obama is conducting treason against the United States of America with the nuclear agreement with Iran. Article III, Section. 3.1 of the *Constitution of the United States of America* states:

"Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort. No Person shall be convicted of Treason unless on the Testimony of two Witnesses to the same overt Act, or on Confession in open Court."

In an article at PJMedia.com, the former United States prosecutor Andrew McCarthy says that Section 2339A of the federal penal code, Title 18

“provides a jail sentence of up to 15 years—or up to life imprisonment if death results from the offense—for anyone who: ‘...provides material support or resources ...knowing ...that they are to be used in preparation for, or in carrying out, [an act of terrorism] ...or in preparation for, or in carrying out, the concealment of an escape from the commission of any such violation, or attempts or conspires to do such an act[.]’ The statute provides a sweeping definition of ‘material support or resources’: ‘The term ‘material support or resources’ means any property, tangible or intangible, or service, including currency or monetary instruments or financial securities, financial services, lodging, training, expert advice or assistance, safehouses, false documentation or identification, communications equipment, facilities, weapons, lethal substances, explosives, personnel (1 or more individuals who may be or include oneself), and transportation, except medicine or religious materials[.]’” Inasmuch as Iran is a recognized state sponsor of terrorism, and “Obama’s Iran deal will provide Iran with over \$100 billion, and opens the door to its acquisition of sophisticated weaponry (wholly apart from Iran’s nuclear development activities)” the Obama-Kerry agreement is “the most astronomical provision of material support and resources to terrorism—as that term is defined in federal law (see above)—in the history of the world.”

(Section 2339B of the penal code) “states, ‘Whoever knowingly provides material support or resources to a foreign terrorist organization, or attempts or conspires to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and, if the death of any person results, shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life.’ The statute goes on to require proof that an accused person knows: ‘...that the organization is a designated terrorist organization[,] ...that the organization has engaged or engages in terrorist activity[,] ...or that the organization has engaged or engages in terrorism[.]’ It is incontestable that ...Obama, Secretary Kerry, and their subordinates know all three things about Hezbollah and Hamas, even though the statute requires knowledge of only one of them to establish guilt. It bears emphasizing that for all their absurd claims about how the ...Iran deal reins in Iran’s nuclear program, even Obama administration officials feel compelled to admit that Iran will step up its material support to terrorism while it is receiving the windfall from the deal. That is not just unconscionable; it is criminal. How can Obama’s Iran deal

conceivably be supported by anyone who claims to oppose international terrorism or support Israel?”<sup>21</sup>

Another act of aiding the enemy is letting the Islamic terrorists in custody at the Guantanamo, Cuba retention facility go free. Two major examples come to the fore. According to FrontPageMag.com,

“When Mohammed Zahir was caught, among his possessions was found a small sealed can marked, in Russian, ‘Heavy Water U235 150 Grams.’ According to the classified report, the uranium had been identified by Zahir ‘in his memorandum as being intended for the production of an ‘atom bomb.’” Zahir was not just another captured Jihadist. He was the Secretary General of the Taliban’s Intelligence Directorate and was in contact with top leaders of the Taliban and Al Qaeda. His possessions included a fax with questions intended for Osama bin Laden and he had been arrested on suspicion of possessing Stinger missiles. ...Zahir was the closest thing to a major nuclear terrorist in United States custody. Freeing him was wildly irresponsible even by the standards of a leader who had sacrificed thousands of Americans in a futile effort to ‘win’ Afghan hearts and minds. Nor did Obama even bother with the plausible deniability of releasing him to a South American country, the way he had with his previous batch of ISIS recruits, or at least to Qatar. Instead Mohammed Zahir went back directly to the battlefield in Afghanistan. Obama couldn’t have done more without handing over the blueprints for constructing a nuclear bomb. ...Americans no longer expect the man in the White House not to release terrorists. We no longer expect him not to release dangerous terrorists who will go on to kill Americans. Now we also know that it’s useless to expect him not to release terrorists caught trying to assemble materials for a nuclear bomb. We’ve tried to grade Obama on a curve when it comes to national security, but the curve just got nuked. The very lowest possible expectation we can have of Obama is that he won’t release a nuclear terrorist. And even this lowest of all possible expectations proved too much for him to live up to. Which terrorists will Obama release next? The answer appears to be all of them.”<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> <http://pjmedia.com/andrewmccarthy/2015/09/09/kerry-letter-to-congress-obama-administrations-guilty-plea-to-iran-deals-material-support-to-terrorism/?singlepage=true>.

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.frontpagemag.com/2014/dgreenfield/obama-frees-a-nuclear-terrorist/>

The next terrorist Barack Hussein Obama released from the Guantanamo retention facility (Camp Justice) to qualify as an action that Barack Hussein Obama is committing treason against the United States of America was Abdul Rahman Shalabi, who was released to Saudi Arabia on September 21, 2015,

In May, 2008, Rear Adm. David M. Thomas, who was then-commander of the Joint Task Force at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba wrote a memo with nine reasons why Abdul Rahman Shalabi should not be released.

- “Detainee (Shalabi) is a member of al-Qaida and a long-term bodyguard for Usama Bin Laden (UBL), serving in that position beginning in 1999.”
- “Detainee received specialized close combat training for his role as a suicide operative in an aborted component of the 11 September 2001 al-Qaida attacks.”
- “Detainee participated in hostilities against U.S. and Coalition forces and was captured with a group referred to as the Dirty 30, which included UBL (Usama Bin Laden) bodyguards and an assessed 20th 11 September 2001 hijacker.”
- “Detainee received advanced training at multiple al-Qaida camps.”
- “Detainee also has familial ties to UBL and has demonstrated his hatred for Americans at JTFGTMO (Gitmo) and will likely reestablish ties to al-Qaida and other extremist elements if released.”
- “A HIGH risk, as he is likely to pose a threat to the U.S., its interests and allies.”
- “A HIGH threat from a detention perspective.”
- “Of HIGH intelligence value.”
- “His overall behavior has been mostly noncompliant and hostile to the guard force and staff. He currently has 95 Reports of Disciplinary

---

<http://www.andyworthington.co.uk/2014/12/21/four-insignificant-afghan-prisoners-released-from-guantanamo/>.

Infraction listed in DIMS with the most recent occurring on 27 February 2008, when he was reported spitting on the guard force.”<sup>23</sup>

Considering Barack Hussein Obama's recent diplomatic recognition of Cuba it is not beyond the possibility that the culmination of the release of the Islamic terrorists in Guantanamo will be shortly before the end of his present illegal occupancy of the Oval Office in January 2017. It is even more likely that he will return the facility at Guantanamo Bay to Cuba without consulting Congress. The non-approval by Congress and the non-consultation of Congress is a method Barack Hussein Obama has used throughout the terms of his regime.

#### **4.4 BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA'S OATH OF OFFICE**

Upon usurping the office of Presidency of the United States of America, Barack Hussein Obama took the oath of office on 20 January 2009. The constitutional oath is in Article II, Section, 1, Clause 8. of the *Constitution for the United States of America*:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

The phrasing "to the best of my Ability" leaves a lot of loophole room for Barack Hussein Obama not to "preserve, protect and defend the *Constitution for the United States*. It is a matter of record that Barack Hussein Obama has broken his oath as often as he wanted to break it. Barack Hussein Obama has violated his

---

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2015/09/breaking-obama-releases-20th-9-11-hijacker-from-gitmo/>. Read also <http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials/092415-772691-obama-releases-high-risk-911-20th-hijacker.htm?p=full>. <http://iotwreport.com/obama-releases-20th-9-11-hijacker-from-gitmo/>.

oath of office by breaking the laws of the *Constitution* at least 63 times as of August 6, 2015.<sup>24</sup>

1. Used Executive Action in direct opposition to the law, and unilaterally changed the law for at least five million illegal aliens; Article 1 Section 1, All Legislative power held by Congress; “he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” Article II Section 3; Article I Section 8.
2. Direct violation of the ACA (Affordable Care Act) Law ( Section 36B ) ordered subsidies be paid under Federal Exchange. Article. I, Section 1; Article II, Section 3.
3. Ignored law by taking Iran Deal to the United Nations prior to 60-day review period mandated by Iran Nuclear Agreement Review, and failed to turn over side agreements as outlined. – “he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” Article II Section 3.
4. Ignored Congressional Treaty Powers. Article II Section 1, Article II Section 2.
5. Operation Choke Point program (Investigation of banks and business for fraud and money laundering) – Direct infringement on 2nd Amendment.
6. Violated the statute on “Material Support of Terrorism” by returning top terrorists back to terrorist organizations. Article II Section 3; Dereliction of Duty Article II Section 4.
7. Violated the Appropriations Act (DOD [Department of Defense] Section 8111) – GAO (Government Accounting Office) report; Article II Section 3.
8. Ignored the laws that requires Congress be notified prior to any detainees being moved from Guantanamo. “he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” Article II Section 3

---

<sup>24</sup> [https://tisaboutfreedom.wordpress.com/2013/03/27/a-list-of-obamas-constitutional-violations.](https://tisaboutfreedom.wordpress.com/2013/03/27/a-list-of-obamas-constitutional-violations/) /



9. Using EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) to “legislate” over States, Congress, and Federal Court; Article II Section 3; Article I Section 8; Direct violation of Presidential Oath.
10. Appointed 24+ Federal agency czars without advice and consent of the Senate; Violation of Article II Section 2.
11. Used Executive Privilege in regards to Fast & Furious gun running scandal. When Government misconduct is the concern Executive privilege is *negated*.
12. Signed 23 Executive Orders on gun control – infringement of the 2nd Amendment.
13. Exposed the identity and methods of operation of a Navy SEAL team – It is illegal for a President to reveal classified military secrets. Article II Section 3.
14. Undertook 2 Executive actions mandating that private health information on patients be turned over to NICS (National Instant Criminal Background Check System) – Violation of HIPPA (Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act) law.
15. Issued an Executive Order bypassing Congress on immigration – Article 1 Section 1, All Legislative power held by Congress; Article II Section 3; Article I Section 8.
16. Unilaterally issued new exemptions to immigration restrictions law that bars certain asylum-seekers and refugees who provided “limited material support” to terrorists. – Article 1 Section 1; Article I Section 8. Congress shall have the Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.
17. Issued directive instructing ICE (Immigration and Custom Enforcement) to NOT enforce immigration laws in certain cases. Article 1 Section 1, All

Legislative power held by Congress; “he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” Article II Section 3; Article I Section 8.

18. Release of convicted illegal aliens ordered in direct opposition to law- Article II Section 3.
19. Expanded executive action for amnesty to illegal immigrant relatives of DREAM (Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors) Act beneficiaries. Article 1 Section 1, All Legislative power held by Congress; “he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” Article II Section 3; Article I Section 8.
20. Executive action directing DHS (Department of Homeland Security) that almost all immigration offenses were unenforceable absent a separate criminal conviction. Article 1 Section 1, All Legislative power held by Congress; “he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” Article II Section 3; Article I Section 8.
21. Ignores Law (2006 Secure Fence Act) “he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” Article II Section 3.
22. Used DOJ (Department of Justice) to ignore section 8 of the Voting Rights Act. ”he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed,” Article II Section 3
23. Used DOJ to prevent Arizona and Alabama from enforcing immigration laws. – 10th Amendment.
24. Information memorandum telling states that they can waive the work requirement for welfare recipients, thereby altering the 1996 welfare reform law. – Article 1 Section 1, All Legislative power held by Congress.
25. Used NLRB (National Labor Relations Board) to dictate to a business where they can do business. (Boeing Dreamliner Plant). No Constitutional authority to do so.

26. NDAA (National Defense Authorization Act) – Section 1021. Due process Rights negated. Violation of 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th Amendments.
27. Executive Order 13603 NDRP (National Defense Resources 'Preparedness) – Government can seize anything.
28. Executive Order 13524 – Gives INTERPOL (International Police Organization) jurisdiction on American soil beyond law enforcement agencies, including the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation).
29. Executive Order 13636 Infrastructure Cybersecurity – Bypassing Congress Article 1 Section 1, All Legislative power held by Congress.
30. Attempt to tax political contributions – 1st Amendment.
31. DOMA (Defense of Marriage Act) Law – Obama directed DOJ to ignore the Constitution and separation of powers and not enforce the law. " he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed," Article II Section 3
32. Dodd-Frank – Due process and separation of powers. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau writing and interpreting law. Article. I, Section 1.
33. Drone strikes on American Citizens – 5th Amendment Due process Rights negated.
34. Bypassed Congress and gave EPA power to advance Cap-n-Trade.
35. Attempt for Graphic tobacco warnings (under appeal) – 1st Amendment.
36. Four Executive appointments – Senate was NOT in recess (Court has ruled unconstitutional yet the appointees still remain).
37. Obama took Chairmanship of U.N. Security Council – Violation of Section 9.

38. ACA (ObamaCare) mandate – SCOTUS (Supreme Court of the United States) rewrote legislation and made it a tax because there is no constitutional authority for Congress to force Americans to engage in commerce. SCOTUS has no authority to Legislate or lay taxes. Article I, Section 1 & 8.
39. Contraceptive, abortifacients mandate violation of 1st Amendment.
40. Healthcare waivers – No president has dispensing powers.
41. Refuses to acknowledge state's 10th Amendment rights to nullify ObamaCare.
42. Going after states (Arizona lawsuit) for upholding Federal law (immigration) -10th Amendment.
43. Chrysler Bailout -TARP (Troubled Asset Relief Program) – violated creditors rights and bankruptcy law, as well as Takings and Due Process Clauses – 5th Amendment (G.W. Bush also illegally used TARP funds for bailouts).
44. The IPAB (Independent Payment Advisory Board) (appointees by the president). Any decisions by IPAB will instantly become law starting in 2014 – Separation of Powers, Article 1 Section 1.
45. Congress did not approve Obama's war in Libya. Article I, Section 8, First illegal war the U.S. has engaged in. Impeachable under Article II, Section 4; War Powers Act – Article II Section 3.
46. Obama falsely claims U.N. can usurp Congressional war powers.
47. Obama has continuously acted outside the constitutional power given him – this in itself is unconstitutional.

48. Bribery of Senator Ben Nelson and Senator Mary Landrey. (Cornhusker Kickback and Louisiana Purchase) Article II, Section 4.
49. With the *approval* of Obama, the NSA and the FBI are tapping directly into the servers of 9 internet companies to gain access to emails, video/audio, photos, documents, etc. This program is code named PRISM. NSA (National Security Agency) also collecting data on all phone calls in U.S. – Violation of 4th Amendment.
50. Directed signing of U.N. Firearms treaty – 2nd Amendment.
51. The Senate/Obama immigration bill (approved by both) raises revenue – Section 7. All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.
52. Obama altered law – (A president has no authority to alter law) Delayed upholding the Employer Mandate Law (ACA) until 2015 – Individual Mandate will be enforced. A President does not have that authority – Article. I. Section. 1. *All legislative Powers* herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States; The president “shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed” -Article II, Section 3; Equal Protection Clause -14th Amendment.
53. Obama altered law – ACA Medicare cuts delayed until 2015. Article. I. Section. 1; Article II, Section 3.
54. Obama altered law – Enforcement of eligibility requirements for ACA delayed until 2015. Article I, Section 1; Article II, Section 3.
55. Obama wavered ACA Income Verification Article I, Section 1; Article II, Section 3.
56. Obama altered law – Delayed ACA caps on out of pocket expenses until 2015. (when implemented premiums will skyrocket). Article. I. Section. 1; Article II, Section 3.

57. Obama ignored judicial order to fulfill legal obligation regarding Yucca Mountain waste. Article II, Section 3.
58. Waived Federal provision that prevents U.S. From arming terrorist groups – Article I. Section 1; Impeachable under Article III, Section 3.
59. Directed State Department HS (Homeland Security) to ignore law barring entry to U.S. to those giving political or charitable aid to known terrorist groups. Article. I. Section. 1; Article II, Section 3.
60. Obama shelves part of the ACA Law for Insurers, extending the life of non-qualifying (according to ACA) plans until Jan. 1, 2015. Article. I. Section. 1; Article II, Section 3. Violation of the Take Care Clause, Separation of Powers.
61. Obama waved the ACA individual mandate for those that lost their insurance. Article. I. Section. 1; Article II, Section 3. Violation of the Take Care Clause, Separation of Powers.
62. Obama alters ACA law and exempts companies employing between 50-100 full-time workers from business mandate until 2016. Article. I. Section. 1; Article II, Section 3.
63. In total, Obama has unilaterally altered the ACA 24 times. Article. I. Section. 1; Article II, Section 3. Violation of the Take Care Clause, Separation of Powers.

There has been much speculation that Barack Hussein Obama is a Muslim. The Islamic law states that if one's father is/was a Muslim then the child is/was a Muslim. This fact is important concerning Barack Hussein Obama's conduct and actions after taking the presidential oath of office on January 20, 2019 and January 20, 2013 because it appears that Barack Hussein Obama conducts his relationship to his oath of office as a Muslim would handle a Muslim's oath of office.

In Islam and for Muslims, oaths are sworn to Allah only. In *Sahih Al-Bukhari Hadith*, 5.177, Umar narrated that "the Prophet said, 'If anybody has to take an oath he should swear only by Allah.' "The people of Quraish used to swear by their fathers, but the Prophet said, 'Do not swear by your fathers.'"

It is also possible for Muslims to break their oaths if he or she finds something better. In *Sahih Al-Bukhari Hadith* 7.427, and 8.712, narrated by Zahdam we read "By Allah, and Allah willing, if I take an oath and later find something else better than that, then I do what is better and expiate my oath."

Deciding what is better is a subjective matter. Thus any Muslim is allowed to break any oath at that Muslim's will with no regard whatsoever to the previous oath. This is allowed when Muslims take their oaths of office, as well. Because oaths of office in democratic republics can be taken by swearing upon the Koran and not the Holy Bible, ultimately that person's allegiance is to Allah only and not to any constitutional law of the democratic republic. This behavior makes the so-called laws of the jungle just and moral. Consider this:

"The Muslim law with regard to oaths is a modification of the Talmudic law, for from the Divine Law the Jewish doctors deduced many special cases of perjury, which are thus classified:

(1) *Jus jurandum promassorium*, a rash or inconsiderate oath for the future, or a false assertion respecting the past (Leviticus. 5:4).

(2) *Vanum*, an absurd contradictory assertion.

(3) *Depositum*, breach of contract denied (Leviticus 9:11).

(4) *Testimonii*, judicial perjury (Leviticus 5:1). The Mosaic law admitted expiation in the case of rash or forgotten oaths, (Leviticus 4:4), but the *Yaminu 'l-mun'aqid* of Muhammadan law allows a much greater latitude, for it applies to all vows or oaths excepting those *intentionally* false made with regard to future events.

The teaching of Muhammadan jurists on the subject of oaths and vows, exhibits that *reservatio mentalis* of Muhammadan morality which is so similar to

that of the Jewish Rabbis, and which was condemned by Jesus Christ in the *Gospel of Saint Matthew* 18:16.

Sunni writers on jurisprudence say that an oath should be expressed by such attributes of the deity as are commonly used in swearing, such as the *power*, or the *glory*, or the *might* of Allah, because an oath is usually expressed wider (than) one or other of those qualities; and the sense of *gamin*, (strength) is by this means obtained, since as the swearer believes in the power, glory, and might and other attributes of the deity, it follows that the mention of these attributes only is sufficient to strengthen the resolution in the performance of the act vowed, or the avoidance thereof.

If a man swear 'by the knowledge of Allah,' it does not constitute an oath, because an oath expressed by the knowledge of Allah is not in use; moreover, by 'knowledge' is frequently implied merely that which is known; and in this sense the word knowledge is not expressive either of the name of Allah, or of any of His attributes. In the same manner, should a person swear 'by the wrath of God Allah,' or 'by the mercy of Allah,' it does not constitute an oath, because an oath is not commonly expressed by any of these attributes. ... ."<sup>25</sup>

In not upholding the oath of office of the presidency, it is obvious that Barack Hussein Obama has no respect for the *Constitution for the United States of America*, and thus no respect for WE the People!

## **5. ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION AND UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES**

For over two centuries the United States of America has historically been a beacon of hope and freedom to the rest of the world. Millions of people have immigrated to this country since it was founded. The United States has a proud tradition as a welcoming place for those seeking a better life and for those wishing

---

<sup>25</sup> <http://answering-islam.org/Books/Hughes/o.htm>. In the quoted passage I have added (Allah) as if the statements would apply to Islam.  
See also <http://www.thecompleteobamatimeline.com/uploads/3/5/7/4/3574872/deadlyconcepts-of-the-ancient-islam.pdf>.



to take advantage of the opportunities presented in a free society. Immigrants from Europe, Asia, Latin America, and other parts of the world have come here over the centuries to help forge the world's greatest nation. It is this *melting pot* of different traditions and mutual respect among all Americans that continue to make the United States of America the leader of the free world. However, with the freedoms and rights granted to American citizens – even to authorized visitors – comes the duty to ensure that those who follow the rules and enter the country legally are not usurped by those who break the rules and enter the country illegally.

The issue of protecting America's borders and halting illegal immigration has always been an important concern, but this concern has grown to become one of the most important issues of the day since the events of September 11, 2001. With the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on 9/11 it became clear to all Americans that the nation faced a new threat that may be greater than anything Americans have faced in their history. While putative president Barack Hussein Obama allows the situation in the Middle East to rage out of control – even to the extent that Iran will become a nuclear power – millions of ordinary Americans recognize that global jihad represents a clear and present danger to the American nation. WE the People have seen overwhelming and indisputable evidence that America's national borders are not secure, and that millions of people have entered the United States undetected. As we learned on 9/11, it only takes a small number of people to wield devastation on a massive scale. America's porous southern border leaves open the truth that Islamic terrorists – indeed, terrorists of any kind – can easily cross into the country undetected.

This is, of course, not the only threat that the United States faces with regard to illegal immigration and illegal aliens. There are, by some estimates, at least 20 million undocumented aliens currently living in the United States. These millions of people present a massive strain on the nation in economic terms, as they often work for low wages and take jobs away from legal American citizens. Many of them also take advantage of American social welfare systems and receive

benefits such as food stamps and even cash payments, both of which are funded by hard-working American taxpayers. These same illegal aliens also often work in jobs where they are paid *under the table*. Thus, their paychecks are not taxed like the paychecks of American citizens and legal visitors to this country. When illegal aliens become ill or injured, they go to hospital emergency rooms which are already overcrowded and overworked. Their children attend the public schools, draining resources away from the children of the taxpayers who pay for these schools. As long as the federal government refuses to do anything about illegal immigration and protecting America's borders, these problems will only get worse.

Despite the crushing defeat of the DemocrAT Party in the 2014 midterm elections, Barack Hussein Obama has made no indication that he intends to follow the clear will of the people, nor has Barack Hussein Obama acknowledged the obvious mandate that was given to the Republicans as they took back control of the Senate. Instead of working with the Republican leadership to craft real immigration reform legislation that will help turn back the tide of illegal immigrants flooding across America's borders, Barack Hussein Obama has made it clear that he will issue executive orders intended to protect millions of illegal aliens from being deported. While it is within the purview of a President to issue Executive Orders for some actions, the decision to override Congress in such a serious matter represents a flagrant abuse of power by Barack Hussein Obama.

The Obama regime is doing as much as it can to allow the entry of illegal immigrant job-holders and illegal job-seekers into the United States in a time when legal American citizens cannot find employment in the American economy. Indeed, of the over 11 million illegal immigrants in the United States the Barack Hussein Obama regime is deporting practically nobody.<sup>26</sup>

*The Washington Post* has written that

---

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2015/10/06/us-government-deports-fewest-immigrants-in-nearly-decade/?intcmp=hplnws>.

“In recent months, the Department of Homeland Security has taken steps to ensure that the majority of the United States’ [estimated] 11.3 million undocumented immigrants can stay in this country, with agents narrowing enforcement efforts to three groups of illegal migrants: convicted criminals, terrorism threats or those who recently crossed the border. ...The new policies direct agents to focus on the three priority groups and leave virtually everyone else alone. ...Deportations ...are dropping. The Obama administration is on pace to remove 229,000 people from the country this year, a 27 percent fall from last year and nearly 50 or more percent less than the all-time high in 2012.”<sup>27</sup>

All of this is transpiring at the same time Barack Hussein Obama is allowing up to 100,000 Syrian Muslim refugees into the United States and refusing to allow Syrian and Iraqi Christians into the United States.<sup>28</sup>

Illegal immigrants are receiving amnesty because Barack Hussein Obama refuses to enforce existing immigration law. Barack Hussein Obama knows that he will not be forced to answer for his unconstitutional activities because the United States Senate would never be able to muster the necessary 67 votes to convict him for impeachment.

The epitomé of the situation is mirrored in what Mark Knoller of CBS News has tweeted, “WH (White House) issues veto threat today against DHS funding bill if House GOP ‘mucks around’ with ...Obama’s immigration exec actions.”<sup>29</sup>

The current Speaker of the House of Representatives, John Boehner, is correct in calling Barack Hussein Obama’s amnesty action is a “serious breach of our Constitution”<sup>30</sup> The Internal Revenue Service policies, Medicare, Medicaid,

---

<sup>27</sup> [http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/dhs-scales-back-deportations-aims-to-integrateillegal-immigrants-into-society/2015/07/02/890960d2-1b56-11e5-93b7-5eddc056ad8a\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/dhs-scales-back-deportations-aims-to-integrateillegal-immigrants-into-society/2015/07/02/890960d2-1b56-11e5-93b7-5eddc056ad8a_story.html).

<sup>28</sup> [http://www.catholic.org/news/international/middle\\_east/story.php?id=62653](http://www.catholic.org/news/international/middle_east/story.php?id=62653)  
<http://www.christiantoday.com/article/iraqi.christian.refugees.turned.away.by.usa/66319.htm>.

<sup>29</sup> <http://twitchy.com/2015/01/12/veto-threatened-if-gop-mucks-around-with-presidents-executive-actions-on-amnesty/> and <https://twitter.com/PostmasterBen/status/554751864911450112>.

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/terence-p-jeffrey/boehner-obamas-action-seriousthreat-our-system-government>.

Social Security, ObamaCare, AMTRAK, the Department of Education, the FDA (Federal Drug Administration), the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency), welfare programs, as well as other political programs, laws, and agencies of the Barack Hussein Obama regime are also breaches of the *Constitution*. However, John Boehner's protests have no meaning. He will not block anything that does not agree with the *Constitution* because as of October 30, 2015 he will have resigned as Speaker of the House of Representatives.<sup>31</sup>

Barack Hussein Obama will threaten to defund the Department of Homeland Security and thus place more than 300 million Americans at the whims of illegal immigrants if Congress blocks his illegal immigrant amnesty.<sup>32</sup> This is ample reason for the impeachment of Barack Hussein Obama.

Of course, Barack Hussein Obama realizes that he is treading on dangerous ground if he decides to use Executive Orders to grant amnesty to millions of illegal aliens. He has clearly decided to make a calculated risk, because the potential benefits to the DemocrAT Party, in his mind, could outweigh the consequences. By allowing millions of illegal aliens to remain in the country, Obama is setting them on a path to citizenship.

Obviously, if millions of new voters who have been dependent on the federal government are allowed to participate in future electoral processes, the result would be a huge boon to the DemocrATS. The process is already underway in California.<sup>33</sup> With only a little more than one year remaining in his regime, Barack Hussein Obama is clearly counting on the idea that the Republicans in Congress

---

<sup>31</sup> However, as of this writing, John Boehner has said that he will stay in his position as Speaker of the House of Representatives "until the Caucus nominates someone – but, until that person can confirm 218 votes on the House floor (needed to take the Speaker's gavel). Short of that – Boehner will stay on for the rest of this Congress and steer legislation that is pending." Consult <http://iotwreport.com/bret-baier-breaking-john-boehner-has-agreed-to-stay-on-as-speaker/#MOoLCrbGaTmCZH52.99>.

<sup>32</sup> <https://www.rt.com/usa/232831-homeland-security-funding-lapse/>.

<sup>33</sup> <http://toprightnews.com/gov-jerry-brown-signs-bill-that-could-let-massive-numbers-of-illegal-aliens-vote/>.

will not have the steadfastness and backbone to impeach him. If he manages to leave office with his Executive Orders and Executive Memorandums on immigration intact, the damage will have been done. That is why this represents such a serious issue and a long-term threat to WE the People and Our nation.<sup>34</sup>

When Barack Hussein Obama's *executive orders* are combined with his *executive memoranda*, Barack Hussein Obama has issued more than any President since James Earl Carter. There is no legal distinction between an *executive order* and an *executive memorandum*. However, the action allows Barack Hussein Obama to claim that he has issued fewer executive orders than Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, William Jefferson Clinton, and George W. Bush. The politically dumb and politically brain-dead American electorate do not realize the difference. Thus they are of the opinion that Barack Hussein Obama is a leader who pays strict attention to the laws of the *Constitution* in conducting his official executive powers.

## **6. THE KILLING OF AMBASSADOR J. CHRISTOPHER STEVENS IN BENGHAZI, LIBYA**

On September 11, 2012, the eleventh anniversary of the Islamic terrorist attack on the World Trade Center in New York City, a group of Islamic terrorists raided a diplomatic compound in Benghazi, Libya. As the terrorists stormed the compound they descended upon dozens of people inside and killed the United States Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens and a Foreign Service agent Sean Smith. Within hours another assault took place at a separate compound during which two Central Intelligence Agency contractors Tyrone S. Woods and Glen Doherty were killed and dozens of others were injured. At a time when security should have been heightened at facilities such as these, it was clear that the

---

<sup>34</sup> <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2014/12/16/obama-presidential-memoranda-executive-orders/20191805/> and [http://hotair.com/archives/2014/12/17/dont-worry-its-not-an-executive-action-its-amemorandum/?utm\\_source=hadaily&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=nl](http://hotair.com/archives/2014/12/17/dont-worry-its-not-an-executive-action-its-amemorandum/?utm_source=hadaily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=nl).

decision makers at the highest levels, such as Barack Hussein Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, had failed to meet their responsibilities.

It was immediately clear in the aftermath of these attacks that the White House was moving to cover up its failures in Benghazi. In the first public comments about the terrorist raid, Barack Hussein Obama – who was running for reelection at the time – refused to acknowledge that Ambassador Stevens had been killed in a terrorist attack. This was nothing less than a blatant political strategy, as Barack Hussein Obama could not afford to admit that he and his regime had allowed the compound in Libya to go unprotected at a time when it would have been so obviously vulnerable. Before and during the attacks there were calls from individuals on the ground at each of the two sites for backup and support from the military and the Central Intelligence Agency, but in both instances the potential respondents were told to stand down, i.e., take no action. It is impossible to know what may have happened if proper security had been in place or if a military backup had arrived in a timely manner, but we do know the reality of what happened: more Americans were killed by Islamic terrorists and Barack Hussein Obama took no action!

Barack Hussein Obama and his regime have done everything they can to avoid taking responsibility for what happened at Benghazi, Libya. They have also taken steps to cover up their actions both before and after the attacks. While Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton was still in office there had been repeated calls for increased security in the weeks and days prior to the attack, as the people serving America in Libya understood that September 11 represents a triumph for the Islamic jihadists who wish to destroy the United States of America. The evidence uncovered in subsequent investigations shows that these requests for additional security were repeatedly ignored by the State Department, leaving the compound and the CIA annex vulnerable.

Compounding their egregious failures and dereliction of duty in the days leading up to the Benghazi attack, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Barack Hussein

Obama, and other members of the regime have repeatedly stonewalled investigators and thwarted all attempts to uncover what happened that day. The putative occupier of the Oval Office refused to acknowledge that it was in fact an Islamic terrorist attack, and the White House regime put out the story that it was simply a *protest* that had gotten out of hand. By describing it as a protest, rather than a planned and coordinated terrorist attack, the Barack Hussein Obama regime hoped to argue that it was a spontaneous event that they could not have prevented, and that it happened too quickly for any security response or support to be sent in to protect the Americans in the Benghazi compound. Subsequent investigations led by Congressman Darrell Issa (R-CA) when he was Chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee and other Republican members of the House of Representatives, such as Harold Watson "Trey" Gowdy (R-SC) Chairman of a House Select Committee to investigate the 2012 Benghazi terrorist attack, overwhelming evidence, including the so-called deleted Hillary Rodham Clinton emails that have been recovered, show how Barack Hussein Obama, Hillary Rodham Clinton, and other members of the Obama regime abdicated their responsibilities on that day. Moreover, they have since taken steps to hide the truth of their failures from the members of Congress and the American people, including attempts to get other people to lie to Congress. For these reasons, Barack Hussein Obama should be impeached for his failure to protect the United States Ambassador in Libya and for the covering up of this crime and other crimes that he has committed since he has occupied the Oval Office.

## **7. OBAMACARE**

There are some interesting statistics concerning the status of present-day health care under Barack Hussein Obama. For example; "Insurers lost at least 12 percent on Affordable Care Act plans in 2014."<sup>35</sup> The fifth ObamaCare co-operative in the state of Kentucky, Kentucky Health Cooperative, has announced it

---

<sup>35</sup> <http://dailysignal.com/2015/10/13/report-insurers-lost-a-lot-of-money-selling-obamacare-plans/>.

will not have any health care plans in 2016.<sup>36</sup> Healthcare premiums are up \$4865 since Obama promised to cut them \$2500.<sup>37</sup> Another fact is that in 2016, 15 million Americans will face up to 52 percent increases in their monthly Medicare premiums. Moreover, there will be no cost of living allowance in monthly Social Security payments to retirees. Across the board, the costs of ObamaCare are exploding.<sup>38</sup> This statistic underscores the Barack Hussein Obama lie of the promise "If you like your healthcare plan you can keep it?" Of course, this was nothing more than an added lie to the list of Barack Hussein Obama's innumerable lies.

There are major setbacks to Barack Hussein Obama's Affordable Care Act, Firstly, the DailySignal.com has reported that,

"New York state and federal regulators ordered the U.S.'s largest nonprofit health insurance provider established under the Affordable Care Act, the Health Republic Insurance of New York, to shut its doors by the end of the year as it continues to trend toward insolvency. The announcement Friday (September 26, 2015) disrupts health coverage for more than 200,000 people. The Health Republic Insurance of New York received more than \$265 million in taxpayer-funded loans, according to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. It is too early to know how much the company will be able to repay. Despite becoming the second largest provider of health coverage on the state's ACA exchange, Politico reported the insurer lost \$130 million during its first 18 months of operations."<sup>39</sup>

A second setback is the ruling by Federal District Court Judge Rosemary Collyer who refuses to accede to a request by the Obama regime to dismiss a lawsuit brought

---

<sup>36</sup> <http://dailysignal.com/2015/10/14/another-obamacare-collapse-kentucky-health-co-op-goes-under/>

<sup>37</sup> <http://www.allenbwest.com/2015/09/healthcare-premiums-up-4865-since-obama-promised-to-cut-them-2500/>.

<sup>38</sup> <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/medicare-premiums-to-increase-for-15-million/article/2573831>.

<sup>39</sup> [http://dailysignal.com/2015/09/28/obamacares-largest-co-op-collapses-marking-4th-failure-of-the-year/?](http://dailysignal.com/2015/09/28/obamacares-largest-co-op-collapses-marking-4th-failure-of-the-year/)



against ObamaCare by the House of Representatives. Hans von Spakovsky of the DailySignal.com explains,

“The challenge by the House makes two claims against the Obama administration and specifically Sylvia Burwell, the secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, and Jacob Lew, the secretary of the Treasury. First, that the administration has spent ‘billions of unappropriated dollars to support’ Obamacare. Second, that the administration ‘effectively amended the Affordable Care Act’s employer mandate by delaying its effect and narrowing its scope.’” The ObamaCare legislation calls for payments to insurance companies to offset losses that are “funded and re-funded by annual, current appropriations.” But the Obama administration has been improperly issuing payments to insurers even though Congress never appropriated funds for that purpose. In addition, ObamaCare specifically called for the employer mandate to commence on December 31, 2013 but, for political purposes, the administration postponed that date without the legal authority to do so.” Von Spakovsky continues, “The House of Representatives may still lose this lawsuit in the long run. But this decision is a significant defeat for the administration, which had hoped to get the entire case dismissed without a trial. The case will now go forward, to be decided on the merits of whether the administration used unappropriated funds and violated the Constitution.”<sup>40</sup>

One of Barack Hussein Obama's first undertakings when he usurped office was to announce that he intended to implement health care reform. While there is no question that the American health care system at the time had some problems, and could have been improved in many ways, it was still the best health care system in the world. Although critics of the American health care system complained about costs, or about access for some people, people from all around the world have come to the United States of America seeking the best medical treatment when the systems in their own countries failed them. The United States is home to some of the best doctors, nurses, hospitals, teaching institutions and research facilities in the entire world. While our system arguably needed some

---

<sup>40</sup> [http://dailysignal.com/2015/09/25/lawsuit-obamacare-legs/?utm\\_source=heritagefoundation&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=morningbell&mkt\\_tok=3RkMMJWWfF9wsRouu67IZKoniHpfsX56%2B4qXqS%2BIMI%2F0ER3fOvrPUfGjI4ATcZqNa%2BTFAwTG5toziV8R7jHKM1t0sEQWBHm](http://dailysignal.com/2015/09/25/lawsuit-obamacare-legs/?utm_source=heritagefoundation&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=morningbell&mkt_tok=3RkMMJWWfF9wsRouu67IZKoniHpfsX56%2B4qXqS%2BIMI%2F0ER3fOvrPUfGjI4ATcZqNa%2BTFAwTG5toziV8R7jHKM1t0sEQWBHm).

improvements, what it did not need was a complete government takeover that forced millions of Americans off their current plans and into government-controlled *health care exchanges* that mandated their coverage, often at significantly higher expense. One of the central promises made by Barack Hussein Obama was that “If you like you current health care plan, you can keep it.” – the Obama lie of the year in 2013.<sup>41</sup> As far too many Americans have discovered, the passage of the so-called Affordable Care Act has meant that they have lost their insurance plans, have been forced to purchase more expensive plans, and in many cases have not been able to see the doctors and other health care providers of their choice. Moreover, the ObamaCare plan has not been successful. Recent statistics show one-quarter of those who originally signed for ObamaCare have now been deleted from the program.<sup>42</sup>

It has come to light that Jonathan Gruber, professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, one of the architects of ObamaCare, admitted that the planners of the program purposefully misled Congress and the American people in order to get the legislation passed. The designers of this unworkable and outrageously expensive government takeover of health care counted on the *stupidity* of many voters when creating a plan that was complicated and poorly organized. Jonathan Gruber formulated his arguments in favor of ObamaCare with the words that Congressional representatives and We the People were too dumb to really comprehend what ObamaCare entailed and what was happening. Even before this legislation was passed, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi publicly announced that the only way to see what was in the bill was to pass it. Barack Hussein Obama and the willing DemocRAT-controlled Congress rammed this legislation through over the unanimous objections of Congressional Republicans, knowing that once that was done it would be difficult, if not impossible, to undo the damage. Moreover, as the deadline for the implementation of ObamaCare drew closer, the American people who had not been paying

---

<sup>41</sup> <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/article/2013/dec/12/lie-year-if-you-like-your-health-care-plan-keep-it/>.

<sup>42</sup> <http://nobamacare.com/delays-changes-and-now-deletions-for-obamacare/>.

attention began to see what a disaster this legislation really was. As many critics had predicted, the rollout of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) website was completely botched, serving to support the idea that the government has no business taking over a system that is better left to the private sector, where a combination of competition and common-sense regulatory oversight would be a more efficient way to ensure both quality and affordable health care access. By some accounts, the combined cost of the Obamacare website system, not the entire ACA plan, but just the computer system, has cost in the neighborhood of \$2 billion dollars or more.<sup>43</sup> Moreover, millions of Americans were forced off their insurance plans and into the ObamaCare system under threat of fines and legal penalties, yet when they tried to enroll for new insurance on the ObamaCare website they found that the system was completely unworkable. Not surprisingly, the botched implementation of this unwieldy and poorly developed system caused the eventual resignation of Barack Hussein Obama's Director of Health and Human Services, Kathleen Sebelius, but by that time much of the irreparable damage had already been done.

When Barack Hussein Obama issued Executive Orders delaying the implementation of some aspects of ObamaCare, Barack Hussein Obama violated the laws that he had pushed so hard to get passed, The decision to implement such delays may have been politically expedient, but it was hardly fair to those who had tried to follow the rules in good faith. Moreover, it was in direct violation of the rules of ObamaCare that were supposedly intended to ensure that the system was fair and workable. Barack Hussein Obama and the DemocRATS in Congress argued that the implementation of ObamaCare would simply make it possible for more people to get health insurance. What they did not emphasize was that the federal government would be subsidizing the costs of premiums for tens of millions of Americans, which actually means that the same hardworking Americans who are paying for their own health insurance are now also paying more in taxes to cover the costs of health insurance for other people, as well. In addition, the rules

---

<sup>43</sup> <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-09-24/obamacare-website-costs-exceed-2-billion-study-finds>

of ObamaCare force millions of Americans to purchase a product that they may not even want, which would appear to be a direct violation of both the spirit and the letter of the law as mandated by the *Constitution for the United States of America*. Despite this obviously unconstitutional rule, the Barack Hussein Obama regime managed to convince the courts that the costs of ObamaCare to individuals were legal under the government's authority to levy taxes.

Several of these issues are currently serving as the basis for a plethora of citizen, state, and congressional lawsuits. Among the issues under review is the mandate of ObamaCare to provide subsidies to cover insurance costs, which critics have argued is a clear violation of the law. If this component of ObamaCare is struck down, it is very likely that the entire system will be successfully undermined. Other lawsuits pertaining to Barack Hussein Obama's Executive Orders and other illegal and unconstitutional actions related to ObamaCare are making their way through the court systems now. With the Senate reverting to Republican control in 2015, it has been hoped that a Republican-led Congress would finally repeal this abhorrent legislation, although the re-election of spineless-whiskey-glass-holder John Boehner, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the re-election of slowest-turtle-of-turtles Mitch McConnell as the Senate Majority Leader do not indicate this. As noted above, John Boehner has announced he will resign the Speakership and retire from Congress as a representative from Ohio effective October 30, but if the necessary votes to elect a new Speaker are not obtained, he will stay in the position. The damage John Boehner could do until November 1, could be devastating. As of this writing Breitbart.com has unconfirmed reports that House Speaker John Boehner has made a deal with House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi to give Barack Hussein Obama everything he wants in the upcoming budget that would not shut down the government. The major financial continuation would be the continued funding of Planned Parenthood, an organization that sells body parts of aborted babies.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2015/09/25/rumors-capitol-hill-boehner-cut-deal-pelosi-avoid-government-shutdown/>. The investigative journalist Sharyl Attkinon has started a website

Regardless of how the court cases play out, or what actions Senate and House Republicans take in 2015, the Trojan-horse socialism of ObamaCare remains one of the worst pieces of legislation ever passed in the United States of America. Along with the specific charges Barack Hussein Obama should face over his illegal Executive Orders on ObamaCare, his decision to force this undemocratic, socialist system upon the American people is clearly an impeachable offense, and not only because of the lies involved.

## **8. GOVERNMENT SPENDING**

One of the greatest concerns Barack Hussein Obama's critics have had since he took office is the rate at which government spending has grown. Barack Hussein Obama's decision to implement ObamaCare and other government programs has come at a staggering cost. A detailed accounting of the spending by Barack Hussein Obama and the DemocRATS in Congress would fill an entire encyclopedia, but even a cursory glance at the numbers shows the level of fiscal irresponsibility of this usurper. When Barack Hussein Obama took office in 2009 the nation was already faced with a \$10 trillion national debt. This is, of course, a large figure, and much of this debt came as a result of the United States having to finance operations against the enemies who attacked us on 9/11 and the enemies who threaten the security of countries in the Middle East that are not America's enemies. Despite these expenses, the War on Terror had been successful under President George W. Bush, and the missions in Iraq and Afghanistan were winding down when George W. Bush handed the White House over to his illegal successor. Former President George W. Bush (11946 - ; President 2001-1009) was also responsible for stewarding the nation when the global financial meltdown threatened the economic security and stability of the entire world in 2007 and 2008.

---

<http://linkis.com/sharylattkisson.com/ILXrs>, where people can report about ObamaCare fails, and in the reply section at <https://sharylattkisson.com/obamacare-fail-stories/>.

When Barack Hussein Obama took office, instead of adhering to a course of fiscal responsibility and reasonable budget measures, he and the DemocRATS in Congress immediately pushed for economic stimulus spending of hundreds of billions of dollar, and borrowing against the nation's future. This action has evidently driven the national debt up to \$18.3 trillion and increasing.<sup>45</sup> Just as the more responsible members of Congress on the Republican side warned, this reckless spending did little to spur the economy, and may have even slowed the rate of recovery. The global recession which began in 2007 continued to drag on for years as Barack Hussein Obama ruled over the country, and the unemployment rate rose into double digits. Even now, almost seven years after he usurped the Oval Office, the national debt remains at record-high levels, and the economy has yet to fully recover. On top of the poor economic decisions Barack Hussein Obama has made, he and his regime have continued to place onerous and restrictive regulations and tax burdens on American businesses at a time when they most needed a hands-off approach by the federal government. To offset the most apparent effects of his policies, Barack Hussein Obama has supported *quantitative easing*, meaning that this policy has flooded the market with dollars to give the appearance of economic growth. In the short term, these actions have done little to help the economy. In the long term, Barack Hussein Obama's irresponsible fiscal stewardship will leave future generations to pay off the debts. Such reckless disregard for the American people and the nation's economic prosperity and security make it clear that Barack Hussein Obama has abdicated his responsibilities.

## **9. THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE (IRS) AND THE TEA PARTY**

One of the complaints that critics of former President Richard M. Nixon (1913-1994; President 1969-1974) used to make was that Richard M. Nixon ordered the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to spy on his political enemies.

---

<sup>45</sup> <http://www.usdebtclock.org/>.

While there is some evidence that former FBI director J. Edgar Hoover (1895-1972; Director 1935-1972) was involved in some unsavory activities in his role as director, many of the complaints about Nixon steering Hoover to act against Nixon's political opponents seem to be, at best, somewhat overblown. In contrast to the situation regarding Nixon and Hoover, it is entirely clear that Barack Hussein Obama and his regime have used the powers of their offices to influence other government agencies to target Barack Hussein Obama's political enemies. In the wake of Barack Hussein Obama becoming the putative president, millions of concerned citizens who saw their taxes growing by the year decided it was finally time to take action. Coming together under the loosely-knit banner of the *TEA Party* (with the word TEA serving as an acronym for *Taxed Enough Already*) these concerned Americans began to protest the policies of the Barack Hussein Obama regime, specifically those that involved more taxes and more spending by the federal government.

As these individuals became more formally organized, they established political action groups and other organizations devoted to getting their message out to other Americans. In retaliation to this political opposition, the White House ordered the Internal Revenue Service to flag the tax returns of these groups for auditing, while largely ignoring similar groups of citizens who supported the DemocRAT Party policies (and likely benefited from government spending). As it became clear that this unfair and illegal targeting by the IRS was taking place, some members of Congress began to investigate the situation. Just as they have with the Benghazi evildoing and other scandals, the administration that promised to be the most transparent in history stonewalled investigators and covered up their actions. The mounting evidence of IRS misdeeds led to some resignations, but no criminal prosecutions. Once again (and with the aid of a complicit Department of Justice and the Attorney General Eric Holder [1951 - ]) Barack Hussein Obama managed to get away with something that was, in and of itself, clearly an impeachable offense.

## 10. SPYING ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

In the wake of the 9/11 attacks it became clear that the federal government had to take steps to protect Americans against future terrorist attacks. With the passage of the Patriot Act, the Department of Homeland Security and the National Security Agency were given expanded powers to monitor the communications of suspected terrorists. When Barack Hussein Obama took office, the federal government began secretly spying not just on suspected terrorists, but on millions of innocent and unsuspecting Americans. This egregious abuse of government power is in direct opposition to both the laws and the principles of freedom on which our nation was founded. As is the case with Obama's other violations, this alone should be reason enough to bring charges of impeachment against him.<sup>46</sup>

## 11. QUINTESSENCE

Aaron Klein and Brenda J. Elliot have presented the case for impeaching Barack Hussein Obama in their book *Impeachable Offenses*, which discusses in detail the arguments presented in this essay.<sup>47</sup> Andrew C. McCarthy organizes these and other arguments into seven articles of impeachment. They are:

Article I      The President's Willful Refusal to Execute the Laws Faithfully and Usurpation of the Legislative Authority of Congress

Article II      Usurping the Constitutional Authority and Prerogatives of Congress

---

<sup>46</sup> <http://www.globalresearch.ca/intrusive-surveillance-obama-defends-nsa-spying-on-americans/5366314> See also <http://endoftheamericandream.com/archives/64-percent-of-news-reporters-believe-that-obama-is-spying-on-them>.  
<http://beforeitsnews.com/alternative/2014/05/are-you-on-obamas-kill-list-2960572.html>  
<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jun/7/the-national-security-agencys-collection-of-phone-/?page=1>

<sup>47</sup> Aaron Klein and Brenda J. Elliott, *Impeachable Offenses: The Case for Removing Barack Obama from Office*, WND Books, Washington, DC: 2013, pp. 96-156.



- Article III Dereliction of Duty as President and Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces
- Article IV Fraud on the American People
- Article V Failure to Execute the Immigration Laws Faithfully
- Article VI Failure to Execute the Laws Faithfully: The Department of Justice
- Article VII Willfully undermining the Constitutional Rights of the American People That He Is Sworn To Preserve, Protect, and Defend.<sup>48</sup>

The above declaration of impeachment against Barack Hussein Obama is further supported by Joe Arpaio, the elected sheriff of Maricopa County, Arizona, who formed a Cold Case Posse to investigate Barack Hussein Obama's long-form birth certificate that was made public by the White House on April 27, 2011. Sheriff Arpaio also investigated Barack Hussein Obama's Selective Service Card. The posse's conclusion is that the long-form birth certificate is a computer-generated forgery. In news conferences held on March 1, 2012 and March 31, 2012, respectively, Sheriff Arpaio's Cold Case Posse presented evidence that both documents are forgeries. Sheriff Arpaio's evidence has not been presented to members of Congress because the present Speaker of the House of Representatives, John Boehner, has blocked all attempts to have it shown before committees and have Congress conduct an investigation concerning the forged documents<sup>49</sup>

In a time when millions of Americans have grown cynical about politics and government, it has become far too easy to simply ignore the problems and look the other way as the Barack Hussein Obama runs roughshod over the *Constitution for the United States of America*. When taken together, however, these breakings

---

<sup>48</sup> Andrew C. McCarthy, *Faithless Execution Building the Political Case for Obama's Impeachment*, Encounter Books, New York: 2014, pp. 96-155.

<sup>49</sup> <http://www.thelastgreatstand.com/lgs/2014/08/08/john-boehner-is-the-one-blocking-sheriff-arpaios-posse-from-busting-obama/>

of the law by Barack Hussein Obama make it painfully clear that he has no respect for the *Constitution*, and with this in mind it is the responsibility of our elected officials to live up to their oaths of office and impeach the usurper Barack Hussein Obama. WE the People have a responsibility to the future of this country to preserve the *Constitution* and to remove from office any President of the United States of America who fails to honor it.

Even if Barack Hussein Obama were impeached, not found guilty, and not sentenced, the process would be worth it because

- The process of impeachment would uncover evidence that Barack Hussein Obama aids and abets the enemy. Barack Hussein Obama's Nuclear Agreement with Iran sidesteps the United States Congress and is highly supportive of Iran, which has never stopped killing Americans. Millions of Americans will be killed as a result of Obama's selling out to Iran.<sup>50</sup>
- The process of impeachment would reveal Barack Hussein Obama's true relationship with Islam. Obama refuses to recognize IS (the Islamic State, also referred to as ISIL or ISIS) as a terrorist organization as belonging to Islam, for which Barack Hussein Obama has been praised by CAIR, the Council on American Islamic Relations. To the surprise of perhaps no one, the Council on American-Islamic Relations issued a statement thanking Obama “for clearly separating the brutal actions of ISIS from the faith of Islam, and for reminding us all that violence and injustice are not part of any faith.”<sup>51</sup> Another fact is that Barack Hussein Obama's regime gave money to Yousaf al Salafi – allegedly the Pakistan commander of Islamic State (IS) or Daish – who confessed

---

<sup>50</sup> <http://www.frontpagemag.com/fpm/260196/obamas-genocidal-treason-daniel-greenfield>.

<sup>51</sup> <http://www.cair.com/press-center/press-releases/12842-cair-welcomes-president-obamas-prayer-breakfast-remarks-on-islam.html>.

during investigations that he has been receiving funds through the United States.<sup>52</sup> Supporting ISIS is a danger to the security of America.

- The process of impeachment would impair the Obama regime in conducting daily politics and domestic and international relations during the remaining regime months, thus allowing Barack Hussein Obama as little opportunity as possible to continuing doing damage to the United States of America,
- The process of impeachment would signify that the DemocrAT Party was guilty of treasonous activity by underwriting that Barack Hussein Obama met the constitutional qualification to be president.
- The process of impeachment would make Barack Hussein Obama the third president to be impeached. This would be his entry into American history and would be an ever-present spot of ridicule of his narcissistic personality.
- The process of impeachment would underscore the United States of America as being a government of WE the People, for WE the People, and by WE the People!
- The process of impeachment would provide a basis for present-day and future historians to uncover the secrecies of Barack Hussein Obama and the anti-American policies of the DemocrAT Party.
- The process of impeachment would uncover the extent to which Barack Hussein Obama is corrupt and has possible accepted bribes.
- The process of impeachment of Barack Hussein Obama would place the powers that he usurped back in the proper places in Congress.

---

<sup>52</sup> <http://tribune.com.pk/story/828761/startling-revelations-is-operative-confesses-to-getting-funds-via-us/>

- The process of impeachment of Barack Hussein Obama would show that the *Constitution for the United States of America* is a living document, the laws of which apply to all persons.
- The process of impeachment would uncover the machinations of the greatest political con-artist the world has ever experienced.
- The process of impeachment would uncover whether or not Barack Hussein Obama is an agent of a foreign government.
- The process of impeachment would uncover the true identity of Barack Hussein Obama.
- The process of impeachment would uncover any possible drug addiction and/or mental instability that Barack Hussein Obama might have.<sup>53</sup>

The facts are clear.

Therefore ...

---

<sup>53</sup> <https://lockerdome.com/conservativetribune/8117993049836052>. As of the closing of this writing there is, according to John Schindler, a Daily Beast columnist and former National Security Agency intelligence analyst and counterintelligence officer, at least one representative of a European country that believes Barack Hussein Obama "is ill-equipped to handle his duties as president and should be removed from office."

**Barack Hussein Obama must be  
impeached!**

**Barack Hussein Obama must be  
convicted!**

**Barack Hussein Obama must be  
sentenced accordingly!**



Frederick William Dame  
Patriotic, Steadfast, and True  
October 16, 2015.