Why Obama Is Ineligible Regardless Of Where He Was Born

In Phoenix, Arizona on March 1, Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio's "cold case posse" held a news conference to report on its investigation of Obama's birth certificate and Selective Service registration. The investigation concluded that there is "probable cause" to believe that the birth certificate Obama produced in April 2011 was fraudulently generated on a computer and that his 1980 Selective Service registration card is also a forgery. Felony crimes of fraud and forgery were therefore committed.

The investigation also obtained immigration records from the National Archives in an attempt to confirm whether Obama entered the United States from Kenya in 1961 as an infant. The microfilm records the government provided were, however, incomplete. From the 1961 microfilm, one of the 52 weeks of data was missing. Conveniently for Obama, that week just happened to be the week of his birth. Additionally, Arpaio's investigative team has testimony from an individual who met Obama in the early 1980s and who knew the parents of William Ayers. That individual states that the mother of William Ayers told him the family was helping Obama, a "foreign student," with his education. (Obama has claimed that he did not meet Ayers until 1995 and, of course, he would deny that he enrolled in college as a foreign student.)

Arpaio told reporters, "Based on all of the evidence presented and investigated, I cannot in good faith report to you that these documents are authentic. …My investigators believe that the long-form birth certificate was manufactured electronically and that it did not originate in paper format as claimed by the White House. …A continuing investigation is needed to identify the identity of the person or persons involved in creating the alleged birth certificate forgery and to determine who, if anyone, in the White House or the state of Hawaii may have authorized the forgery."

WND.com reported that Arpaio's "…posse says it has identified at least one person of interest in the alleged forgery of Obama's birth certificate. …Mike Zullo, Arpaio's lead investigator, said his team believes the Hawaii Department of Health has engaged in a systematic effort to hide from public inspection any original 1961 birth records it may have in its possession. …Arpaio believes a congressional investigation might be warranted and has asked that any information relevant to the investigation held by other law enforcement agencies be forwarded to his office."

Arpaio stated, "As I said at the beginning of the investigation, [Obama] can put all this to rest quite easily. All he has to do is demand the Hawaii Department of Health release to the American public and to a panel of certified court-authorized forensic examiners all original 1961 paper, microfilm and computer birth records the Hawaii Department of Health has in its possession." Zullo stated, "Absent the authentic Hawaii Department of Health 1961 birth records for …Obama, there is no other credible proof supporting the idea or belief that [he] was born in Hawaii, as he and the White House have consistently asserted. In fact, absent the authentication of Hawaii Department of Health 1961 birth

records for …Obama, there is no other proof he was born anywhere within the United States."

After the results of the investigation were relayed, Arpaio and his team answered questions from the media. Virtually none of the questions dealt with the evidence that was presented. Instead, the reporters questioned Arpaio's motives and attempted to get him to make controversial statements they could use to discredit him. (Arpaio did not take the bait.) The reporters expressed no interest in the possibility that one of the greatest frauds in history has been perpetrated on the American people. They instead asked Arpaio why he is accusing Obama of a crime, why he is "wasting time" on a "settled issue," and whether the birth certificate investigation was meant only to deflect attention from Attorney General Eric Holder's investigation of Maricopa County's efforts to arrest illegal immigrants. Most of the questions reflected an effort to defend Obama, rather than any interest in determining the truth. That Obama committed fraud to gain the office of the presidency should be one of the most significant news stories in the history of the United States, but most mainstream media outlets chose to ignore the news conference completely or to ridicule Arpaio and the "birthers."

The Obama campaign, unable to combat the Arpaio press conference with facts, provided what it said was a "live feed" link to the presentation—but it was a link that led to an episode of the science fiction television series, *The X Files*. The campaign also provided Obama's "birth certificate"—via a link to an ad for a fundraising Obama coffee mug with a picture of the alleged document.

It may be the case that Obama was born in Kenya, after which his maternal grandmother went to a county health department office in Hawaii and registered the event as an at-home birth in Honolulu. A few days later her daughter arrived in Hawaii with her infant son, who was then taken to the hospital for an exam. Kapiolani Hospital has refused to release any documents or confirm that Obama was born there—likely because he was not. The health department may have documents, but they possibly reflect either a reported at-home birth or a foreign birth. That is why Obama had to have a birth certificate forged. August 1961 newspaper announcements do not prove birth at a Honolulu hospital because at-home births and foreign births reported to the county would have been included with hospital births in the lists given to the newspapers.

The forged Selective Service registration would also have been made necessary by a foreign birth—because Obama would not have had to register. In September 2008 Obama told ABC's George Stephanopoulos, "I had to sign up for selective service when I graduated from high school. I actually always thought of the military as an ennobling and, you know, honorable option." Obama then made the remarkable statement that he chose not to enlist only because the war in Vietnam had *ended*: "I graduated in 1979. The Vietnam War had come to an end. We weren't engaged in an active military conflict at that point. And so, it's not an option that I ever decided to pursue." In other words, Obama was making the outlandish argument that he did not enlist only because the United States was *not* at war, and he expected the voters to believe he would have eagerly joined if only he had had the chance to serve in combat in Vietnam. (Stephanopoulos

accepted the statement at face value.) But Obama was mistaken. He did not, in fact, have to sign up for Selective Service when he graduated from high school in 1979, because draft registration ended on March 29, 1975. It was not reinstated until July 21, 1980, more than a year after Obama's high school graduation.

Failure to register with the Selective Service System is punishable by a fine of up to $250,000 and/or up to five years in prison, but it also renders the individual ineligible for *any* job in the Executive Branch of government or the U.S. Postal Service. (If Obama's draft registration is a forgery, not only should he be removed from office, he would not even be able to get a job with the Post Office.) Obama's Selective Service registration form was obtained—after many months of stalling by the government—after a Freedom of Information Act was submitted by a skeptical citizen. One not unreasonable assumption is that after the FOIA request was received, someone loyal to Obama then contacted his campaign—and the necessary document was "produced." (The Arpaio investigators not only believe the form was forged; they believe it was a poor forgery.)

If Obama was born in Kenya he cannot, of course, legally serve as President of the United States. But even if Obama *was* born in Hawaii and no documents were forged, he still cannot legally serve as president. Regardless of the location of his birth, Obama is not a "natural born citizen"—*which requires birth on U.S. soil to two U.S. citizen parents.* Because Obama's father was not a U.S. citizen, Obama himself is only a "native born" citizen. He is not a natural born citizen because only one of his parents was a U.S. citizen.

Many people argue that the term natural born citizen means nothing more than born on U.S. soil, and that the citizenship of the parents is irrelevant. But they should be asked to explain the language of Article II, Section 1, Clause 5 of the U.S. Constitution. Most Americans are probably unaware that the Constitution specifically *excludes* from the natural born citizen requirement individuals who were citizens at the time the Constitution was ratified in 1789. Why would the Founders have included that exception—the "grandfather clause" highlighted in red below? George Washington, John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, et al were citizens of the United States at the time. Why then was special language necessary to make them eligible to serve as president? The answer is that although they were *citizens*, they were not *natural born citizens*. They had been born on U.S. soil but they had not been born to U.S. citizen parents. When Washington was born his parents could not possibly have been U.S. citizens because there were no such persons in 1732. No one could have been a citizen of a non-existent nation.

The Founding Fathers realized that if they required all presidents to be natural born citizens aged 35 or older, *no one* would be eligible to serve as president for 35 years. The term natural born citizen, as used and understood at the time, meant birth on native soil to two citizen parents. But no one age 35 or older was a natural born citizen in 1789, because everyone that age was obviously born before the founding of the nation and could not possibly have had citizen parents. The grandfather clause was therefore included in the text:

> "No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, 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 grandfather clause was necessary so that, in the first four decades of the new republic, individuals who were *not* natural born citizens could still be eligible for the presidency. *That was the sole point of the grandfather clause.* The Constitution essentially says, "If you are a person who was born in the 13 colonies and became a citizen upon the nation's founding, you can serve as president. But if you were born *after* the founding of the nation, you must *also* be a natural born citizen to serve as president; merely having been born on U.S. soil is not sufficient." In other words, "Neither George Washington, nor John Adams, nor Thomas Jefferson, nor anyone else can be president during the next 35 years because they are not natural born citizens. To get around that problem, we shall allow those who are *not* natural born citizens to serve as president as long as they are 'generic' citizens. But that exception does not apply to citizens born after the founding of the United States."

To repeat, Obama's supporters (as well as many of his opponents) claim that the term natural born citizen means nothing more than born on U.S. soil. But that claim is inconsistent with the text of the Constitution—notably the grandfather clause. *If one believes their argument, then the grandfather clause serves no purpose.* Why would the authors of the Constitution have made an exception for those who were *not* natural born citizens if the term only means born on U.S. soil? The grandfather clause, highlighted above in red, *does not need to be there if the Obama supporters are correct.* They therefore need to explain why that clause is present—or accept that Obama is serving illegally.

If one follows the logic of the Obama defenders, then Article II, Section 1, Clause 5 should read as follows:

> "No Person except a natural born Citizen, ~~or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution~~, 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."

But that is *not* how it reads. Additionally, the term "natural born citizen" appears *only* in that one section of the Constitution. Everywhere else the generic term "citizen" is used. Just as "all trees are plants but not all plants are trees," "All natural born citizens are citizens, but not all citizens are natural born citizens." Citizens fall into these categories:

> *Natural born citizens* are individuals born on U.S. soil to two U.S. citizen parents.
>
> *Native born citizens* are individuals born on U.S. soil, without regard to the citizenship of their parents.
>
> *Naturalized citizens* are individuals from other nations who emigrated to the United States and became U.S. citizens through the required legal process.

All three of these categories of individuals are citizens, but only those in the first category are eligible to become president. Obama managed to get elected—with the significant help of the media and his fellow politicians—by taking advantage of the fact that millions of Americans do not understand the differences between the terms.

I have yet to hear a reasonable refutation of these explanations from any Obama supporter. The "arguments" presented are typically, "You're a racist," "You're an idiot," "Who cares about a Constitution written by white slave owners almost 250 years ago?" "Get a life," "Your mother should have aborted you"—or other statements not suitable for the ears of civilized people. To leftists, insults apparently constitute logic.

To defend the Constitution of the United States does not make one a racist. Race and political affiliation have nothing to do with the issue. For the same reason that Obama is not a natural born citizen, neither are Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal or Senator Marco Rubio (R-FL). Those of us who understand that Obama is an illegal president also understand that Jindal and Rubio cannot legally serve as president (or as vice president, based on the 12th Amendment). Jindal and Rubio are neither black nor Democrats. If opposition to Obama is supposedly based on race and political affiliation, how can Obama's defenders explain opposition to Rubio and Jindal? (In fact, many "birthers" strongly support Jindal and Rubio on most issues, but reluctantly admit that they cannot serve as president or vice president.)

In addition to the Constitution itself, historical statements and Supreme Court rulings support the assertion that the citizenship of one's parents is important to the determination of natural born citizen status. It is well established that the Founding Fathers relied heavily on Emerich de Vattel's *The Law of Nations* (1758) in which he wrote, "natural-born citizens, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens" (Chapter 19, Section 212).

Mario Apuzzo, attorney for the plaintiff in Kerchner v. Obama, points out, "The distinction between 'citizen' and 'natural born Citizen' is based on the law of nations which became part of our national common law. According to that law as explained by Vattel in his, The Law of Nations, a 'citizen' is simply a member of the civil society. To become a 'citizen' is to enter into society as a member thereof. On the other hand, a 'natural born Citizen' is a child born in the country of two citizen parents who have already entered into and become members of the society. Vattel also tells us that it is the

'natural born Citizen' who will best preserve and perpetuate the society. This definition of the two distinct terms has been adopted by many United States Supreme Court decisions. Neither the 14th Amendment (which covers only 'citizens' who are permitted to gain membership in and enter American society by either birth on U.S. soil or by naturalization and being subject to the jurisdiction of the United States), nor Congressional Acts, nor any case law has ever changed the original common law definition of a 'natural born Citizen.' Congressional Acts and case law, like the 14th Amendment, have all dealt with the sole question of whether a particular person was going to be allowed to enter into and be a member of American society and thereby be declared a 'citizen.' Never having been changed, the original constitutional meaning of a 'natural born Citizen' prevails today."

In 1862, Congressman John Bingham—the "father of the 14th Amendment"—stated, "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, are natural born citizens.** Gentleman can find no exception to this statement touching natural-born citizens except what is said in the Constitution relating to Indians." [Emphasis added.]

Bingham's 1862 statement *supports* the claim that Obama is not a natural born citizen. A parent who is not a citizen of the United States owes allegiance to another sovereignty. In Obama's case, his father was a citizen of the United Kingdom because Kenya was, in 1961, still part of the British Empire and had not yet become independent. Obama, Sr.'s allegiance was to Great Britain and later to Kenya; it was *never* to the United States. Bobby Jindal's parents were citizens of India on the date of his birth. Rubio's parents were citizens of Cuba when he was born in Florida. Their parents certainly *desired* to become U.S. citizens, but at the time their sons were born they owed allegiance to India and Cuba. Obama, Sr. had no desire to become a U.S. citizen. His desire was to complete his education in the United States and return to Kenya to help establish a socialist government.

In 1866 Bingham stated, "Every human being **born within the jurisdiction of the United States of parents not owing allegiance to any foreign sovereignty is, in the language of your Constitution itself, a natural born citizen**." [Emphasis added.] Bingham's definition was never disputed by other Congressmen. Unscrupulous Obama defenders—including attorneys who have filed legal documents on Obama's behalf—have *omitted* the words "of parents" when quoting Bingham's statement, in a shameful and intentional effort to mislead. (If the Obama supporters have the law on their side, why must they exclude those two words?)

Some argue that Obama is eligible to serve as president as a result of the 14th Amendment. But that amendment has *nothing* to do with presidential eligibility requirements, and the term natural born citizen appears nowhere in the Amendment. The purpose of the 14th Amendment was to declare that slaves freed by the Emancipation Proclamation and the 13th Amendment were U.S. citizens. The relevant part of the amendment reads, "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to

the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

In *Minor v. Happersett* (1875)* Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Morrison Remick 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 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." [Emphasis added.]

The Supreme Court therefore stated, in 1875, the same thing Bingham stated in 1862 and 1866: birth on U.S soil *to two U.S. citizen parents* makes one a natural born citizen. Thus, there is a Supreme Court case confirming the two-citizen-parent requirement for the presidency—a requirement Obama does not satisfy. Granted, the Court also acknowledged that there were some who argued parental citizenship was *not* relevant to the question of citizenship. But the phrase, "Some authorities go further and include as citizens children born within the jurisdiction without reference to the citizenship of their parents" only discusses whether children of non-citizens could be *generic* citizens. Chief Justice Waite does not even consider that they could ever be imagined to be *natural born* citizens. (Waite's statement refers to what is now known as the "anchor baby" question: If foreigners cross the border and have a child in the United States, must it be considered a U.S. citizen? The Supreme Court understood that opinions varied on that issue. But it did not suggest that such children could *ever* be considered natural born citizens.)

Some argue that *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* supports Obama, but it does not. In that 1898 case, the Supreme Curt ruled that a person born in the United States to non-citizen parents living in the United States is a United States citizen. This was the first case that ruled birthplace alone was sufficient to make a person a U.S. *citizen*, but Justice Horace Gray wrote that *Wong Kim Ark* did *not* extend the status of natural born citizen.

It is therefore clear that the Supreme Court and members of Congress considered an individual born on U.S. soil to two U.S. citizen parents a natural born citizen. But the Supreme Court has *never* issued a ruling as to whether anyone else could possibly be considered a natural born citizen. That is why *Kerchner v. Obama* was filed: to force the Court to rule on the issue. But most of the Justices, if not all, refused to hear the case. Why did they not want to hear *Kerchner v. Obama*? If the Justices believed Obama was a natural born citizen, all they had to do was hear the case and issue a ruling accordingly. But they chose not to. Why? Because they knew they would have to rule against Obama, and they did not want to do so. Justices Sonya Sotomayor and Elena Kagan would certainly not want to rule against the very person who put them on the Court in the first place. If Obama were ruled ineligible, their appointments would also be invalid. It is also likely that the Justices feared nationwide riots if they ruled against Obama, and they

believed that by ignoring *Kerchner v. Obama* they could perhaps save thousand of lives and prevent billions of dollars in property damage. That may have been a legitimate concern, but it does not justify allowing someone to illegally serve as president. *If the Justices of the Supreme Court do not believe in the rule of law, why must anyone else?* Supreme Court Justices *live for significant cases like this*. This is a meaty issue, a once-in-a-lifetime chance to "show their chops." Yet they punted. That is *very* significant. It means they were so afraid of the consequences of ruling against Obama that they allowed the Constitution to be perverted.

In addition to *Happersett v. Minor*, there is also *Schneider v. Rusk (1964)*. In that case the Supreme Court stated, "We start from the premise that the rights of citizenship of the native born and of the naturalized person are of the same dignity and are coextensive. **The only difference drawn by the Constitution is that only the 'natural born' citizen is eligible to be President."** The U.S. Supreme Court therefore specifically noted that the term "natural born citizen" does *not* have the same meaning as "native born citizen" or "naturalized citizen." All are citizens, but only one subcategory of citizens can be called natural born citizens. Therefore, birth in Hawaii—if he was born in Hawaii—only makes Obama a native born citizen. To be a natural born citizen requires two U.S. citizen parents—and Obama had only one.

Obama is not the first illegal president. President Chester A. Arthur was born in Fairfield, Vermont in 1829. Arthur's mother was born in Vermont. But Arthur's father, William Arthur, was born in County Antrim, Ireland and emigrated to Canada before entering the United States. He did not become a naturalized citizen until some years *after* his son Chester was born. At birth, therefore, Chester Arthur did *not* have two U.S. citizen parents and was therefore not a natural born citizen. He was born with dual citizenship—the United Kingdom and the United States—and he lied about his past to conceal his ineligibility to hold office as vice president and later as president. Arthur also saw to it that all his personal records were burned upon his death. Needless to say, if the term "natural born citizen" meant then and still means nothing more than "born on U.S. soil," there would have been no need for Arthur to have hidden his past and his father's citizenship. The fact that Arthur did so indicates that—at least when he became president in 1881—most Americans understood natural born citizen to mean something more than simply born on U.S. soil. Many things have changed since 1881, but Article II, Section 1, Clause 5 is not among them. Accordingly, if Chester A. Arthur was an illegal president, *so is Obama*. The only difference is that Arthur hid his past from voters who *understood* the Constitution, while Obama has hidden his past from voters who do *not* understand it.

Many believe that Obama wanted Senator John McCain to be his opponent in 2008 not just because he thought he would be a weak candidate, but because he had his own presidential eligibility issues. Although McCain's parents were both U.S. citizens, he was born in Panama as a result of his father having been stationed there while serving in the U.S. Navy. Some claim that McCain was born on the naval base, which one could arguably call "U.S. soil" and thus treat him as a natural born citizen. Others claim that McCain was born in a non-military hospital in Colon, Panama—which would make it far more difficult to claim that he is a natural born citizen. On February 28, 2008 Senator

Claire McCaskill (D-MO) introduced Senate Bill 2678, the Children of Military Families Natural Born Citizen Act. The bill was intended to allow McCain to be considered a natural born citizen eligible to serve as president. It was co-sponsored by Obama and Senators Hillary Clinton, Robert Menendez, and Tom Coburn. It did not pass.

On April 10, 2008 McCaskill tried again, introducing Senate Resolution 511 to "recognize that John Sidney McCain is a natural born citizen." The resolution was intended to clarify that McCain is eligible to be president even though he was born in Panama. But McCaskill's resolution was worded to provide a "blanket cover" for *other* foreign-born candidates *without* military backgrounds—in an attempt to enable Obama to be eligible to serve as president should it be discovered that he was not born in Hawaii. McCaskill and Obama had the following language inserted, "Whereas previous presidential candidates were born outside of the United States of America and were understood to be eligible to be President…" They unsuccessfully attempted to remove the following language, "…and Whereas John Sidney McCain, III, was born to American citizens on an American military base in the Panama Canal Zone in 1936." The only reasonable explanation for the resolution and the proposed changes to make it more generic and less McCain-specific was to help Obama. After all, far more Americans had questions about Obama's past than McCain's. (McCaskill was an early supporter of Obama and certainly did not wish to see McCain elected.) In any event, such resolutions are legally meaningless. Congress cannot "deem" a person a natural born citizen; he either satisfied the requirements at birth or he did not. No Senate resolution can override the U.S. Constitution.

The logic behind the natural born citizen requirement was to ensure that a president does not have divided loyalties. The more he is separated from allegiance to another nation, the more likely he can serve as commander-in-chief and engage in foreign policy without placing the interests of that nation ahead of those of the United States. If India and Pakistan went to war, could one be certain that a President Jindal would deal with the situation fairly, especially if he still has relatives in India? Could a President Rubio deal objectively with a situation involving Cuba, where he may still have relatives? Has Obama shown proper dealings with Kenya and Great Britain, or have the circumstances of his father's life influenced his decisions? (It is not difficult to make the case that Obama's dealings with those nations have, in fact, been influenced—and to the detriment of the United States.)

If a president's parents were U.S. citizens on the day he was born, either because they were born in the United States or because they had previously become naturalized citizens and swore allegiance to the United States, the logical assumption is that their loyalties would be less subject to question than if they retained ties to another nation. The further removed the president is from foreign roots, the less likely he will be influenced by them.

Note that the Constitution only requires that presidents and vice presidents be natural born citizens. Senators and Congressmen need only be "generic" citizens; they can even

be foreign-born naturalized citizens. The Founding Fathers were less concerned about divided loyalties of members of Congress because those sentiments are diluted as a result of their numbers. A particular senator or congressman may perhaps wrongly place the interests of another nation above those of the United States on an occasional issue, but he does not act alone and can be outvoted. A president, however, engages in foreign policy and commands the Armed Forces of the United States. A rogue president cannot be controlled as easily as a rogue senator or congressman. That is why members of Congress need not be natural born citizens, while presidents must be.

Early drafts of the Constitution required only that the president must be a "[native] born citizen" (not a "natural born citizen"). John Jay then wrote George Washington to suggest that, because of concerns over divided loyalties, the presidential eligibility requirement be strengthened. Those who believe that the term native born citizen is equivalent to the term natural born citizen need to explain Jay's letter and the subsequent change in the wording of the Constitution. Why would an issue have been made about terms that supposedly mean the same thing? The answer is that they do *not* mean the same thing. (One can assume that very few Obama supporters have ever read Jay's letter—if they even know such a letter was written.)

If the citizenship of a presidential candidate's parents is irrelevant, then *any* of the hundreds of thousands of "anchor babies" who have been born in the United States can serve as its president. The American Southwest has many Mexican citizens who crossed the border illegally and who then gave birth to children in U.S. hospitals. Many of those Mexican parents, while enjoying the many advantages of living in the United States, nevertheless owe their allegiance to Mexico and even actively advocate the return of the region to Mexico. There is no doubt that many anchor babies are raised with those same beliefs. Should we, as a nation, allow someone with strong loyalties to Mexico serve as President of the United States? Should the American-born children of radical Islamists who emigrate to the United States—with the intention of establishing a global caliphate—be allowed to serve as president of a nation they despise? Preventing that from happening is *precisely* why the Founding Fathers wanted the president to be a natural born citizen—a person whose loyalties were less likely to be questioned or influenced.

If the American people believe the Constitutional requirements for the presidency are too strict, there is a process for changing them. A Constitutional Amendment can be proposed, voted on by Congress, and ratified by the States. But unless that action is taken, the facts are clear: no one can legally serve as president unless he was born on U.S. soil to two U.S. citizen parents. Congress cannot simply state, "We think the Founding Fathers were wrong, so we will ignore Article II, Section 1, Clause 5." That MSNBC commentators think conservatives are racists does not mean the Constitution can be ignored. That the media refused to investigate Obama's past while digging through Sarah Palin's garbage cans does not justify trashing one of the most significant documents in the history of civilization.

Obama is an illegal president. He cannot be impeached because he does not legally hold the office to begin with. But he can be physically removed from the White House and indicted for the various crimes associated with his illegal activities, such as forgery, conspiracy, fraud, and violations of RICO statutes. (Co-conspirators likely include Nancy Pelosi, Valerie Jarrett, David Axelrod, and Claire McCaskill.) A class action lawsuit can be filed demanding the return of all campaign contributions he collected illegally through fraud.

No, the odds of that happening are not great, but those are the actions that should be taken. At the very least, if Obama cannot be placed behind bars, the American people had better see to it on election day that he is not give another four years to make a mockery of the U.S. Constitution.

Don Fredrick
March 4, 2012

* *Minor v. Happersett* is significant—so significant that in June 2008 supporters of Obama were removing references to that case from the web site Justia.com. That site is *supposed to be* a reliable source of court rulings. The text of at least 25 Supreme Court cases have been corrupted at Justia.com. The case *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* has had three references to *Minor v. Happersett* removed or revised to eliminate the 1875 definition of natural born citizen. After attorney Leo Donofrio identified the deception, the web site scurried to restore the texts to their original states.

Source:
http://www.citizens4freedom.com/Articles/tabid/1387/articleType/ArticleView/articleId/6083/Obama-Natural-Born-Citizen-Issue-Has-a-New-Sinister-Twist--Supreme-court-records-have-been-corrupted.aspx