

Why baby Obama was Born in Vancouver

~The Seattle Scenario, Part II

(reverse-engineering the Dunham-Obama Timeline & Story)

Barack Obama once voted for legislation legalizing killing a baby during delivery, and was rated as the most left-wing Senator in the U.S. Senate for views such as are reflected by that vote. Where did he come by such a view? Why did he refer to being denied an abortion as being “punished with a child”? There is only one place he would have acquired such a view and that is from his own mother.

She, being educated in the truth-uncovering occupations of Social Psychology, Sociology, and Cultural Anthropology, was focused, like those branches of behavioral science, on what the truth is concerning human experience, motivation, and behavior, and would have made him aware of her own experience.

What experience? The experience of unprotected sex, -which led to an unwanted pregnancy, which led to an unwanted birth and an unwanted role of motherhood while still too young to want such a responsibility. She, in her son’s mind, was punished with an unwanted child because of a lack of abortion services, but in reality, also because of a lack of adoption opportunities.

No adoptive parents to be found in Hawaii, Washington State, nor Vancouver. You can figure that he would have placed such a high value on abortion rights because adoption was a total failure in his own mother’s experience (as she conveyed to him for his enlightenment about the real world) .

His view of abortion is connected to his awareness of the short-comings of adoption for African-Americans, -which is connected to his mother’s personal experience, which she honestly, as a cultural anthropologist, conveyed to him so he would learn from her mistake and not leave a young woman in the condition in which she found herself when pregnant with him.

What his attitude reveals, by implication, is that his mother definitely sought out an adoptive couple, and could not find one anywhere, though not for lack of

trying. What is key to the truth is the trying part. She tried in Hawaii and failed. That means she had to then try again in Seattle. That means she was there during July and half of August, (and possibly June) and thereafter. That means her son was not born in Hawaii because she was not *in* Hawaii, -was not born in Seattle either, and was not born in the United States because if he had been then he would have a birth certificate from somewhere in the United States other than Hawaii.

None of this would exist as speculation if she had actually done what any similar young woman who planned to keep her baby would have done, -which would have been to stay in Hawaii close to her mother (and father) before, during, and after the delivery of her first child. There would have been no reason to up and leave one or two weeks later.

Her presence in Seattle after delivery argues for her already being domiciled there in advance. It all boils down to a few very simple realizations, including; if she had no great reason to have to be in Seattle before her delivery, then none would have magically appeared afterward. But if she ever had a great reason to be back in Seattle, then it was to be there before the delivery (with a waiting adoptive couple who would be the means to avoid being stuck with the unwanted role of being a single mother with a bi-racial child in early 1960’s America).

So the thing that drove her to Seattle had to have driven her there before her delivery, and consequently she was not in Hawaii when her son was born. He therefore had to have been born in Vancouver because he has no Washington State birth certificate, nor Oregon, nor Idaho, etc. So her presence in Seattle leads unavoidably to the conclusions this logic arrives at, and those conclusions end with the realization that he is an American who is not a United States citizen.

Obama’s sycophants insist that all speculation is pure bunk because the Great and Powerful Oz of the Hawaiian Dept. of Health hath spoken the unquestion-

able TRUTH and thereby “settled” the issue. But in fact, that argument is pure juvenile bunk. Here’s my reply to a statement by one who puts the word of the Hawaiian government employees on a pedestal, stating: “~just because you say someone lied doesn’t make it true, which is why it is meaningless.”

That logic is meaningless because it presumes that simply because a suspicion is not matched by public knowledge confirming it, then it must be false. I don’t need to even explain how ridiculous that is. Just consider the revelations of Edward Snowden and many other whistle-blowers. What you should have written is: “Just because you think someone told the “truth” does not make it That would reflect a realistic awareness of “realpolitik”.

And speaking of telling the truth, think about the consequences of supporting the Democrat Knight in Shine Armor by deeds of nonfeasance, misfeasance, malfeasance, and lies which are exemplified by the extreme consequences for Lois Lerner. (None!) The Dept. of Health employees in Hawaii can tell any lie they want, as long as it’s not before Congress, to the FBI or a court of law, and if called to account all they have to do is invoke the 5th Amendment, like Lois Lerner, and Presto! Off the hook! Free pass. Heck, they might even get several months of paid vacation!

There’s no downside to protecting the President with obfuscation, distortion and outright lies because they most likely will be rewarded for it. Proof is in the non-firing, non-demotions of those Obama loyalists involved in Fast & Furious, Benghazi, the IRS scandal, and the NSA scandal.

That being the real situation, no one should ever point to the Democratic socialists in the HDoH as a source of unquestionable TRUTH. Instead one must NOT trust, *and* verify. Of course there is no way to verify anything unless Congress issues a subpoena for the physical “vital record” in their archive.

Learn the scandalous string of events and falsehoods regarding the birth certificates here:

<http://butterdezillion.wordpress.com/> To quote:

On June 12, 2008, the Obama campaign sent an e-mail to PolitiFact with [a copy](#) of the senator’s “birth certificate” as an attachment.

Daily Kos & AsperGirl

The same day, June 12, 2008, the Daily Kos [posted](#) the now-infamous Certification of Live Birth (COLB) image along with a cover story. Kos received 648 comments in a span of only 24 hours (the first 644 were about the most insipid, lame, and mindless reactions ever accumulated in one place).

The vast majority of the comments consisted of derogatory comments about John McCain and his eligibility issue:

HOWEVER, there was one, brave Kos commenter who identified all of the key anomalies in the COLB image and had the stones to question it’s authenticity. Her screen name is “AsperGirl” and her comment was [#643](#), or one of the last five comments allowed to be posted.

Why is this significant?

I believe it’s because her comments hit too close to home. I believe she struck a nerve, and that was why the comments section was closed off to new ones less than three hours after the post.

Here are her comments, and they serve as a testament to those loyal to the truth:

Birth Certificate is an Obvious Fake

Sorry to disabuse you folks, but this birth certificate on dailykos is an obvious fake.

The fake “birth certificate” just appeared Thursday morning on dailykos without any reference as to who released it or where it came from.

There is a link from the FightTheSmears website to “the truth” posting on MyBarackObama.com but without any reference to it. (i.e. there is no “this is Barack Obama’s birth certificate provided to dailykos by person xxx of the Obama campaign”)

There is no attribution accounting for where the “birth certificate” came from. In Hawaii, birth certificates aren’t publicly available and reporters’ requests for one have been ignored for months. There is no explanation as to who vouches for its origins or its authenticity.

The certificate number is blacked out. Why?

There are image artifacts consistent with forgeries and image processing. It's not a real, unprocessed scan of a birth certificate.

It's not certified. Hawaii state code provides that certificates issued by the department of health be certified:

"§338-13 Certified copies. (a) Subject to the requirements of sections 338-16, 338-17, and 338-18, the department of health shall, upon request, furnish to any applicant a certified copy of any certificate, or the contents of any certificate, or any part thereof. (b) Copies of the contents of any certificate on file in the department, certified by the department shall be considered for all purposes the same as the original,..."

~ ~ ~

There's a whole lot more at The Obama File website <http://www.theobamafile.com/ObamaCOLB.htm> which contains this:

"The image became increasingly suspect with Israel Insider's revelation that variations of the certificate image were posted on the Photobucket image aggregation website -- including one listing the location of Obama's birth as Antarctica, one with the certificate supposedly issued by the government of North Korea, and another including a purported photo of baby Barack -- one of which has a "photo taken" time-stamp under "File Properties" *just two minutes before* the article and accompanying image was [posted](#) on the left-wing Daily Kos blog.

That strongly suggests that Daily Kos obtained the image from Photobucket, not the State of Hawaii, the Obama family, or the Obama Campaign. Photobucket is not generally known as a credible supplier of official vital records for any of the 50 states, and the liberties that other Photoshoppers took with the certificates confirms this."

Plus there is this; on October 31, 2008, a week before the election, the Hawaiian Department of Health released something that no one understood in a realistic light. It was labeled "NEWS RELEASE" even though it was not news. Rather, it was a posting of three paragraphs under the heading of:

STATEMENT OF DR. CHIYOME FUKINO, all three of which were in quotes.

That meant that what was said was not an official statement by the Department, but merely a "report" of something the Director was being reported as having said to someone at sometime somewhere. If it was a true certified statement by the Director in an official capacity, then it would have been something that would *not* appear in quotes. That indicates that the "News Release" had been thoughtfully crafted by an attorney who knew how to make a statement that was not legally attributable to anyone and yet, -even under the DoH header, no one could be held legally accountable for it, -especially since it was not attributed to a specific quoter and was unsigned.

Placing the statements in quotes rendered them unauthoritative and uncertifiable, making the "news release" neither. Including and especially this middle paragraph:

"Therefore, I as Director of Health for the State of Hawai'i, along with the Registrar of Vital Statistics who has statutory authority to oversee and maintain these type of vital records, have personally seen and verified that the Hawai'i State Department of Health has Sen. Obama's original birth certificate on record in accordance with state policies and procedures." [those quotes are not mine, but are original to the document]

The website points out; "There is nothing in that [statement](#) that states the "birth certificate" Hawaii holds was issued by Hawaii. There is nothing that states Obama was born in the State of Hawaii. PolitiFact.com actually has Okubo on the record [denying](#) that the electronic COLB image provided by the Obama campaign can be authenticated by her or by anyone at DHOH!

PolitiFact.com reported: "*We e-mailed it (a copy) to the Hawaii Department of Health, which maintains such records, to ask if it was real.*" Spokesman Janice Okubo told us: "*~we looked at that image you guys sent us,... I don't know that it's possible for us to even say beyond a doubt what the image on the site represents.*"

See much more here, including many links:
<http://www.birtherreport.com/2010/05/hawaii-doh-destroyed-original-birth.html> ~and here:
http://theobamafile.com/_eligibility/HawaiiPoliciesAndProcedures.htm

So the veracity and authenticity of the short-form Certification has never been established, and can't be. That leaves the truth regarding the whereabouts of Ann Dunham in August of 1961 completely unknown and unproven. Hence speculation is not only permissible but is needed.

There's another good way to find out the truth, and that is to find out what nation's passport Obama used when he traveled to Pakistan in 1980 or '81. That's the trip that he never once mentioned in his two autobiographies about his social upbringing and insights, -the one during which he made a re-connection to the Islamic roots he acquired as a student during Islamic studies in Indonesian elementary school, including practices which, by Islamic belief, rendered him a Muslim.

He mentioned it once during the 2008 campaign while seeking favorably to compare his international experience to that of the former First Lady Hillary Clinton, and then never mentioned it again. Why avoid it? Because of the fear of raising the question of what passport he used to go there.

If he used an *American* passport, it would indicate that Hawaii issued his mother a birth certificate, -one that he would still have had as a Senator and which he could have scanned and released to the public instead of a mysterious string of appearances on the internet of a short-form abstract unsigned, Certification of Live Birth lacking the State Seal, -which wasn't attributed to the Obama campaign until after a clear-cut debunking of the image had not appeared on the internet making it "safe" to official-ize it.

Using an Indonesian passport would be evidence of having Indonesian citizenship. Indonesia did not allow its adult citizens to maintain dual citizenship acquired during years as a minor. Renunciation of foreign citizenship was required to retain citizenship. Such a renunciation oath can be viewed by the State Department as actual renunciation, -as if before an American official. Traveling under a foreign passport is automatic disqualification for an American security

clearance since it is generally a clear sign of allegiance to a foreign power and lack of loyalty to the United States.

But one must consider that his father Lolo definitely would have formally adopted him, thereby making him an Indonesian derivative citizen. That is what lovers and husbands and fathers do for a child of their beloved who was from a previous relationship. My own father did the very same thing for my oldest brother, -my half-brother. No man proposes to the woman he loves and says in effect; "I want you but not your child who is a part of you. I won't adopt him (or her)." Instead he bends over backward to make her happy. So Barry Obama definitely would have become what he became known as; Barry Soetoro: citizen of Indonesia.

At age ten, before traveling back to Hawaii, he would have obtained an Indonesian passport via self-attesting affidavits of his parents which stated the facts regarding him, -perhaps including the reasons why he had no birth certificate that could be presented.

His Indonesian citizenship would have been provisional in nature and not permanent since it would have been acquired via naturalization. It would have been acquired automatically by Indonesian law without naturalization if he had been under five years old, (as if her were Lolo's own child) but he was six years old, so he was not viewed as a natural Indonesian by their legal fiction of law.

Rather, the law would require that he state before an Indonesian official his intent to retain his Indonesian citizenship if he lived continuously for five years in a foreign nation after reaching age 21. Thereafter he would have to repeat that official renewal of citizenship every two years. Doing so would require that he say something or sign something stating that he renounces all allegiance to any foreign government. A mere formality. An empty oath. No sacrifice nor sincerity required.

If his parents acquired his Indonesian passport when he was 10, and it was good for seven years, it would not need to be renewed until he was probably 17 - while still a minor. If it was renewed at 17 for four or five years, he would not have had to do anything to obtain it when he took his trip to Pakistan at age 19 or

20. Then at age 21 he would have had a year to make his declaration of intent to remain an Indonesian citizen and renew his passport personally as an adult.

That very likely would have been very easy to do since his mother and father weren't divorced until the same year that he traveled to Pakistan, so he would have remained as an Indonesian citizen all through his teen years. And when it came to renouncing any second citizenship (U.S.) that may have been quite easy also if he had no American birth certificate to even indicate that he was an American citizen.

If he used an Indonesia passport, then that fact would indicate that he acquired it because he lacked the preferred United States passport and United States citizenship. That would indicate that he lacked an American birth certificate. Without that he had no evidence of U.S. citizenship. All he had was his mother's word in the affidavit given to the Hawaiian Dept of Health. You might say he had presumptive citizenship but not officially recognized citizenship.

His presumptive citizenship would have been based on the erroneous presumption that everyone born within U.S. sovereignty is automatically a U.S. citizen, when that is only legally true of children of immigrants.

Regardless of the universal misconceptions of the United States government, the children of foreign visitors and guest are in the same philosophical and political category as children of Ambassadors since none of them, like their foreign parents, are subject to the political authority of our central government. They remain subject to their own government and only it (in regard to obedience to its national policies and their civic & military obligations).

Just as the foreign-born children of non-resident, non-immigrant foreigners visiting America are separate from the native-born children of such foreigners, (who are separate from the native-born children of resident, domiciled immigrants) so also are the children of America's native citizens, -meaning her natural members. The citizen-born natives and the alien-born natives are both natives and thus similar in that respect, but they both do not have foreign parents, and

that distinguishes them from each other, as is seen in a report from the 1960 Census.

Publisher: U.S. Census Bureau

Survey: Census 1960 (US, County & State)

Documentation: Census 1960

Definitions and Explanations

~NATIVE...persons born in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a possession of the United States. Also included in this category is the small number of persons who, although they were **born in a foreign country or at sea**, have at least one native citizen parent.

[Note by Nash: FOREIGN-BORN AMERICANS ARE CATEGORIZED AS NATIVES BASED ON THEIR NATURAL CITIZENSHIP BY BLOOD]

The native population is further classified on the basis of the country of origin of parents into the two groups, native of **native parentage** and native of **foreign or mixed parentage**, described below.

Table A –

Characteristics of the Population, by Nativity: 1960

Here's the data lay-out table:

<http://h2ooflife.files.wordpress.com/2013/10/1960-census-3b.jpg>

[Note the separation of those born of natives and those born of foreigners or mixed parentage. IT IS FALSE THAT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT RECOGNIZES ONLY THE CATEGORIES OF NATIVES AND NATURALIZED CITIZENS. PARENTAGE IS OF SIGNIFICANT IMPORTANCE.]

PARENTAGE

This category comprises native persons **both** of whose parents are also natives of the United States. [Natural born citizens]

~NATIVE of foreign or mixed parentage:

This group consists of native persons, *one or both* of whose parents are foreign born. [14th Amendment citizens, parents being legal immigrants subject to U.S. jurisdiction]

~**FOREIGN STOCK**

The **foreign-born** population is *combined* with the *native* population of **foreign or mixed parentage** in a *single category* termed the "**Foreign stock.**"

This category comprises all **first and second** generation Americans.

[Note: The first generation is American by naturalization only, while the second generation (without their parents' naturalization), are 14th Amendment native-born citizens. They are natural citizens if born after their parents' naturalization.]

Third and subsequent generations are described as "**native of native parentage.**"

Native persons of foreign parentage whose parents were born in different countries are classified according to the country of birth of the *father*.

[emphasis & comments added]

<http://www.socialexplorer.com/data/C1960CountyDS/documentation/>

Document: Nativity and Parentage (Volume II, Part I – Subject Reports)

citation: U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. Census of Population: 1960. Subject Reports, Nativity and Parentage. Final Report

PC(2)-1A. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1965.

NOTE: According to the U.S. GOVERNMENT definition, BARACK OBAMA IS OF "**FOREIGN STOCK**".

No one of Foreign Stock is eligible to be the Commander-in-Chief of the United States Military because no such citizen was born a natural citizen.

NOTE: The State Department has stated in response to a FOIA request that they do not have a U.S. Passport application on file for Barack H. Obama.

by Adrien Nash Oct. 2013 obama--nation.com

A Re-Cap:

1. With no conceivable reason good enough for an 18 year-old young woman to transplant herself half an ocean way from her own mother just a week or two after giving birth for the first time, it can be suspected and assumed that she had done so before giving birth and for one or more very good reasons.
2. Being as she returned to Hawaii about a year and a half later and over time pursued all of

her further education there, the reason to be living in Seattle would not have been the superiority of the university there, but something much more compelling, and that was the desire to not be saddled with a newborn during her blossoming and independent young adulthood. To avoid such a burden required finding a couple to adopt her child, and none could be found in Hawaii. Hence, her hometown was turned to as an alternate pool in which to fish for an adoptive couple.

3. With such a scenario almost unavoidable as the explanation for her appearance in Seattle following her child's birth, it is accompanied by the unavoidable conclusion that he was not born in Hawaii but in the city of Vancouver, British Columbia because if he had been born in Seattle, then he would have had a Washington State Birth Certificate, which he did not, nor one from any other American state.
4. If she (perhaps with her mother) flew from Vancouver back to Hawaii, spent one or more days checked into a hospital to recover from complications, visited people she knew there including the father, and then sought to register her child's birth with the Hawaiian Dept. of Health by writing out an affidavit in which she honestly stated (rather than lying to the government) the fact of the birth having occurred outside of Hawaii and the United States (anticipating that such facts would not make a difference) then she encountered by a brick wall since late registration was only for at-home Hawaiian births, and international births were under the purview of the INS.
5. Without neither a Vancouver birth certificate nor a Hawaiian birth certificate, her son would have to be dependent on her citizenship for acquiring his, but she was a few months too young for that legally to happen -so he was left as a stateless American with no legal nationality. He fell through the citizenship cracks.
6. Without an American birth certificate, he could not obtain a U.S. passport. By being

adopted by his Indonesian father, he became a provisional Indonesian citizen and would have obtained at age ten an Indonesian passport for traveling to Hawaii to live with his grandparents. If he traveled via a U.S. Visa, he overstayed its time-limit permanently or acquired Green Card permanent residency.

7. Being under 21 years of age, he would have used that passport to travel to Pakistan where he was reintroduced to Islam and had his childhood affinity for it re-awakened.
8. At 21 he affirmed to the Indonesian government (as required by law) his resolve to retain his Indonesian citizenship, and also renewed his passport. Five years later he renewed it again and continued using his Indonesian passport as his principle proof of identity, - having no choice because he'd fallen between the cracks of the citizenship system.
9. He passed himself off (depending on the situation) as a dual-citizen, using and maintaining his Barry Soetoro Indonesian identity (because otherwise he would be stripped of his Indonesian citizenship). His presented status was that of an American with Indonesian citizenship (but actually lacking U.S. citizenship) and it worked, -it opened every important door in his life, right up to running for State Senator, all the while having a publisher's biography which stated he was born in Kenya.
10. With the undisprovable claim that he was born in Hawaii, it is falsely presumed by all that he is therefore a U.S. citizen (even though the 14th Amendment does not cover his birth circumstance) so the lack of an American birth certificate was never a problem until he ran for President of the United States and his campaign refused to produce one.

Eventually one mysteriously and anonymously appeared on the internet, and the lies and debunking of it and its long-form follow-up, have continued ever since, albeit in near total obscurity aside from the internet.

11. Eventually, it was discovered that the long-form pdf image posted on the White House website was so strange and unexplainable because it was produced on a scanner-copier that no one had used to try to replicate its layer anomalies. Being as the White House uses just such a Xerox copier, its multi-layer characteristics were attributed to being the result of the software employed by that line of copiers.
12. Given the arms-length relationship of the President to that birth certificate (his lawyer not allowing it to be in his presence, nor for the press corps to examine-&-photograph it) along with the origin and nature of the short-form Certification of Live Birth, and the factually deficient and deceptively worded and uncertified statements by officials of the Hawaiian government, one cannot escape giving the benefit of the doubt to the strong suspicion that the hard-copy used to produce the pdf image of the long-form birth certificate was itself a forgery concocted in the digital realm from materials supplied by Democrat party employees within the Hawaiian Department of Health, none of whom can be held accountable by their Democrat party superiors in the Democrat party Hawaiian government, because even if an investigation was sought, there would be no evidence, no trail, no fingerprints found anywhere, -and even if there were, questions would not have to be answered because of 5th Amendment protection against being required to testify against oneself (a la Lois Lerner) as well as protection via union representative lawyers.
13. So the perfect crime has been committed, and no one with national or State authority will acknowledge it, nor investigate it, nor hold anyone accountable. And that is in addition to the crime against the Constitution by the non-feasance of the federal government in allowing the election of and placement into office of a non-citizen who is as far from being a natural born citizen as one can conceivably be and still fool almost everyone.