

The Bastardization of Certification of Authenticity

The lax standards of the the Hawaiian vital records office is evidence of an attitude that cares more for convenience than for certitude. This is also reflected in the statements made by Hawaiian officials regarding the counterfeit Obama birth document images that are nothing more than digital files that form a CGI picture of birth certificate forms. They didn't make them, they didn't certify them, they didn't swear in any legal way that they are not forgeries but are true scans of actual documents produced officially by the Hawaiian government. They began going down this inauthentic road when their records were digitized and the text extracted from the pages they were typed on by software used to scan the microfilm or microfiche record of the original paper documents. The extracted text could then be laid on top of an image of security paper and the combined new image could then be printed on fairly ordinary paper, or the text alone could be printed on actual security paper with the green hash pattern.

The bastardization went even farther when in place of an actual signature, a rubber stamp image of one was substituted. The statement that used to accompany the Registrar's certification signature read as follows:

THIS CERTIFIES THAT THE ABOVE IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL RECORD ON FILE.... as seen in the original 1966 copy of the Nordyke twins birth certificates.

The bastardized version instead reads: I certify this is a true copy or abstract of the record on file....

From "TRUE AND CORRECT COPY" to "A TRUE COPY OR ABSTRACT" Understand this, in a valid certification statement the use of the word "OR" would never be allowed because it gives the result that nothing is being certified, but rather, a series of possibilities is being attested to, but no one can know which is the truth and which isn't. Therefore the exact truth remains unknown and the certification certifies nothing in particular, nothing specific and is therefore self-nullifying. A certification statement must be precise, specific, exact, and unequivocal. If one certifies that he is the son of Nelson Mandela, OR the son of Idi Amin where is the specificity needed to know what the truth is? If one certifies that he is the son of Adolph Hitler OR the son of Golda Meyer, what is one to conclude decisively? In the situation of the Hawaiian birth certificate stamp, the certification statement must certify that the pictured document IS an Abstract (not might be one), or IS a True Copy, (not a possible true copy), otherwise nothing has been certified other than a couple of possibilities.

Part of the problem is that there is no such thing as a TRUE ABSTRACT. An abstract is not a true representation of an original document. It's the equivalent of a hand sketch of a photo of real money. It is an abstract derived from an archival micro-image produced by photographing the original. A second generation copy can be certified, but a second generation of a second generation can't be certified because the second generation version underwent an uncertifiable process by software in an environment that allows for easy alteration. Therefore it is, in a practical sense, nonsense to pretend to certify an abstract. But if a certification statement is written that sounds like the original pre-digital statement, which uses the words "TRUE AND CORRECT COPY", but uses instead the official sounding words "TRUE COPY" when it is unequivocally known to NOT be a true copy, then that wording obfuscates the truth about what is actually being stated. It sounds like something is being certified because "TRUE COPY" sounds very official, when in fact, TRUE COPY has absolutely nothing to do with what is being represented image-wise, which is simply an abstract.

What's wrong with an abstract? Absolutely nothing...unless you are the President of the United States and everything surrounding your birth record is highly suspect because you have released two forgeries pretending to be scans of actual official certified copies of Hawaiian records when no such copies have been seen by anyone who can attest to their authenticity, nor even to their verifiable existence. The public presentation of an abstract is the presentation of an image that can be easily altered, whereas an image of an old paper document would be far more difficult to alter unnoticeably.

The released abstract served its purpose perfectly in that it convinced everyone without any experience in digital image manipulation that it is a genuine reproduction, via scanning, of a real paper Hawaiian birth document, when that was not the truth, and no one in authority is willing to testify in any official capacity that it is what it was represented to be, and not really just an abstract. No one who defends the President or the PDF will even bring up the subject of it being an abstract and what that could imply. Their aim has been nearly perfectly accomplished. No one in authority has questioned its authenticity because that would imply that they think the Hawaiian officials and the President have been party to a fraud on the American people and no one is willing to go there. That would be an unsupported claim of such a criminal nature that the powers that be, on both sides, don't even want to think about it, much less give it any credence.