Why baby Obama was Born in Vancouver

~The Seattle Scenario

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

In order to determine the truth about Barack Obama's eligibility to serve as the American President it is necessary to exam two subjects unrelated to each other, those being the location of his birth, and the nationality of his parents. There are three theories explaining the one contested requirement for the office of the President, and two of them involve the issue of the location of a candidate's mother when he or she exited the womb and entered the world.

It is claimed to be connected to the words of the Constitution which require that: "No person except a natural born citizen…shall be eligible to the office of the President,…" [Article II, Sec. I]

The two Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dum theories focus on and insist that those words require native-birth, basing that presumption on another baseless presumption which is that those common language words mean something other than their common meaning, and instead are a legal "term of art", -a claim that neither one of them can validate.

The theory supporting Obama claims that anyone born within American sovereignty is not only "a citizen of the United States" but is also therefore "a natural born citizen" and thus eligible to serve as Commander-in-Chief & President per the Constitution's requirement.

Their rationale is that since the British devolved to labeling every baby born within the sovereignty of the Crown as a natural-born subject, therefore the United States, being the descendant of British law and common law, must also follow the same perversion which supposedly was the accepted status quo at the time of the Revolution and after.

In other words, the greatest philosophical minds in American history, the founders of the nation and framers of the Constitution, the men who believed in unalienable natural rights and not the rights of Kings looked to the rejected British system for how humans relate to their government, and decided that American citizens were not really citizens and the sovereigns of the 13 new nations, but the proposed central government was the new King and was sovereign over them and owned them if born within its borders, just like the King owned everyone born within his.

Supposedly, in their view, native-birth is the basis of citizenship and all native-born persons (even if not *true* natives) can be labeled as natural born citizens, -with "natural" somehow meaning "native".

Its doppelganger (the third theory) embraces the same "term of art" interpretation of "natural born citizen" with the presumption of native-birth being necessary for natural citizenship, but they add a second, unrelated requirement which is American parentage. The first theory is about citizenship based on borders alone while the third theory is based on both borders and blood. So "natural born citizen" means either one who is:

1.) born in America. 2.) born *of* Americans.
3.) both born *in* America *and* born *of* Americans.

A VATTELIAN FANTASY:

The explanation of the Mario Apuzzo doctrine as to why that third Frankenstein approach is logical and legitimate involves elaborate elucidations containing manifold distortions of fact and common sense regarding the fundamental principles of language and logic. But the founders did not have (nor require having) a definition of what a natural born citizen is because those words did not exist as a "term of art" in need of a definition but as common words commonly used in conjunction. It is a pure fantasy to argue otherwise since such an argument is unsupportable by anything in colonial law or history.

It was steeped in the British system of law imposed in the colonies, which was built around "The Divine Right of Kings" philosophy in which the King was to be obeyed as Lord & Master (and owner) of all souls born within his dominion with one word describing

the members of the monarch's nation, that word being "**subject**", -*not* CITIZEN.

In support of their hybrid basis of citizenship, they present an extensive collection of quotes of presumptuous suppositions, ambiguous statements or twisted meanings by uncertain men mouthing what they'd always heard and read from ignorant men who preceded them and who were educated in the British monarchist manner of thinking, none of whom grasped the fundamental underlying principle on which the natural membership of free men in a democratic republic is based.

All of their non-apropos quotes come from men who were slaves to their sovereign, as his subjects for life, or were brain-washed by Law colleges whose body of law was all or largely British based as to origin. But in the new free republic of the united Colonies / States of America, the CITIZENS were the sovereigns, and the government owed them allegiance, -not the other way around.

The *sovereign* Citizens of the united STATES of AMERICA would own the government, -the government would not own them. The allegiance that was owed by Citizens was to each other, their State, their Union, and their enterprise of self-government based on a written Constitution and Bill of Rights. That government would have no authority over their natural membership in their own independently-established system of self-governance.

If you and some wealthy friends establish a private club, does the club secretary or grounds-keeper have the authority to tell any of you that you are not a member because of his or her arbitrary rules?

Does any authority have a moral and legal basis to tell you that you do not belong to your mother and father if you were not born under their roof (within their jurisdiction)?

Place of birth is a totally arbitrary rule based on no principle whatsoever, but instead on an invented, artificial, abstract, invisible line claimed by monarchs based on conquest or treaty. It has nothing more to do with natural membership in a country than the borders of your parents' property had anything to do with who your own parents and siblings are and whether or not you are a natural member of the family they comprise.

The Vattelists arrive at a destination that is absurd on its face because it is a distortion and perversion of his non-authoritative observations and requires that "natural" does not simply mean natural but instead means an invented combination of natural blood-based membership with legal border-based membership.

But natural national membership, i.e., natural citizenship, is not dependent on a distortion of the writings of Emmerich de Vattel, nor the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Rights of Man nor the Magna Carta. It is a fundamental element of the basic nature of sentient life.
It is the basis of cohesive societies and nations, being an upward extension of the principle by which people belong to their own family.

By that same principle they also belong to their own nation. Law has nothing to do with it. Nothing that is connected to Law is Natural. Instead it is man-made, arbitrary and legal in nature. Nothing that is legal is natural, and nothing that is natural is legal. Two different universes, -but one exists inside of the other like a small grove of oak trees inside a vast forest of evergreens. The legal realm exists as a human construct within the natural and philosophical universe whose fundamental nature includes certain primal principles, -principles from which human jurisprudence draws its understanding of natural rights.

Vattel's writings have no connection to the words "natural born citizen" although it is claimed that he is the source of the term (it was used in a 1795 translation of his massive "The Law of Nations" –first published in French in 1758).

He didn't actually deliberately define nor even use the words "Les citoyens naturels", nor characterize as a definition his observation that native persons are those born in their parents' homeland. He never stated anything like " The definition of "Les citoyens naturel" is the following;...". The root basis of the Blood & Borders theory is that he *did* author such a definition and yet that dogma is without any factual foundation since he did no such thing. He wasn't in

the defining and dictating business. He was in the observing, describing & explaining business.

The flaws in the premise of the Blood & Borders theory are these:
1. *De Citoyens et Naturels* (the title of the citizenship section) means:
"Of Citizens & Natives" (*not* Of Citizens & Natural-born-Citizens.

2. "Les Naturels" means natural or native inhabitants and thus is not a synonym for "citizen" ("born" also is completely missing). If the title had been: "De Citoyens Naturels" another problem would appear because the position is taken that the concept of natural citizens is non-existent, and instead all "natural born citizens" must be defined as a combination of natural law *and* human law (being a "term of art".

With that dogma, the words "natural born citizen" cannot ever be referred to as a natural member of a nation because natural membership doesn't exist. Only the term of art definition exists and it must always be referred to with quotation marks (the Constitution being its source) since it is supposed that the words do not mean what the words alone mean.

3. He used the phrase "The natives or indigenous population" to describe the inhabitants of nations and the countries they occupy. Nothing more.

4. He did not "define" citizens, born citizens, natural citizens, nor natural born citizens.

5. He observed the source of natural membership in a nation is one's father's nationality (like father, like son).
6. With a father's nationality being the sole source of natural inherited national membership, the location of the birth transition from womb-to-world was rendered irrelevant in regards to natural law.

7. Vattel NEVER offered, suggested, nor endorsed the unnatural hybrid concept that natives are only those whose birth met the criteria of both "jus soli" *and* "jus sanguinis" national membership.

If such a concept was legitimate, historical, and enshrined *as law* there would be a record of it, and yet there is none. No nation in history had a legal requirement that those it recognized as natural natives must not only be born of natives but also be born on national soil.

Its equivalent would be a nation like China having a law that defined natural born Chinese citizens as only those born of Chinese citizens *and* born of ethnic Chinese parents. Or a rule that allows only children born of your parents to be viewed as their natural children and your natural siblings if they are born within the boundaries of their property. If they were not then they would have to be legally adopted as unrelated non-family children.

Such a combination of criteria (blood and borders) is unnatural and non-existent in every civilized society on Earth. Plus there's the fact that the United States government (like all or most governments) recognizes all children of its citizens as natives regardless of where in the world they are born.

Any government that does not is stuck in an antiquated, medieval monarchical system not based on individual natural rights. I'd like to see one country on Earth identified that has ever required that those it considers its natural citizens be both children of citizens as well as native born. It instead is always one or the other; "either…, or…" -not "*and*".

It's either jus soli (by right of soil) or jus sanguinis (by right of blood) depending on whether or not the father is a native or an alien. It's never both.

The truth is that most natural citizens (the children of citizens) *are* native-born, but some are not, and… most native-born citizens *are* natural citizens but some are not because they are born of aliens. They instead are *legal* citizens via automatic "naturalization" bestowed by the authority of the 14th Amendment.

If both parents of a presidential candidate must be Americans then that requirement would disqualify Barack Obama since his father was a foreign student.

If the father is an alien, and "natural born citizen" is a "term of art" meaning what they assert that it means, then a requirement that Obama Sr's child be both native-born *and* American-fathered in order to qualify to be President would render junior ineligible also.

But if that theory of eligibility is false, then the justification for such a claimed requirement is invalid and imaginary, and since it cannot be met in Obama's case it provides twice the basis for their insistence that Obama is ineligible to be President. He would be ineligible either by being born outside of the United States and / or by not having an American father.

Their conjoined-twin retorts that native-birth alone is sufficient for 14th Amendment citizenship, and that that type of citizenship can be considered "natural" because of the perverted history of that word in English common law. Ambiguity was deliberately injected by the monarchy which used the rationale that such native-born children of foreigners were naturally subjects of the Crown since they were born within the King's dominion, -and, -even though not born of his natural subjects, they were born of his alien subjects, so being born of subjects, they were naturally subject as well, -not by nature but by force.

That ambiguity is what they base their entire native-birth = natural citizen dogma on. Their logic is that the native-born are all naturally subject to the federal government, -which is false. During the Civil War all sons of immigrant aliens were officially labeled "Aliens" just like their fathers, (following the policy of the United States from its inception) and thus were exempt from conscription by the military. Only citizens and their sons could be drafted, -not the native-born alien-fathered sons of immigrants.

That later was changed after a San Francisco-born son of Chinese immigrants (Wong Kim Ark) prompted the Supreme Court to rule that by the 14th Amendment he was not an alien but a citizen since he was born fully subject to federal jurisdiction (which it requires) and not Chinese jurisdiction only.

The court ruled that children of immigrants are U.S. citizens if born subject to the full jurisdiction of Washington, but it did not rule that the two things that Obama relies on are also true. They are the presumptions that the ruling not only applies to children of immigrants but also to children born of foreign guests, tourists and visitors, -exempting only those of foreign ambassadors, with all such children labeled (falsely) American citizens being therefore *natural born citizens* based solely on the place of their birth alone.

So citizens like Mr. Wong, who gained American citizenship against the policy of the executive branch of the U.S. government which sued to prevent it, went from being viewed as aliens to being viewed somehow as <u>natural born citizens</u> eligible to be President, -likewise for those who are not like Mr. Wong and are *not* children of immigrants but were born of transient foreigners, -including even one born on Hawaiian soil during a re-fueling stop-over. No philosophy nor principle nor law justifies such a brain-dead policy.

Regardless of what kind of mass-murdering war-criminal or autocratic foreign warlord father they had, America must accept them as being qualified to be the Commander-in-Chief against all of the realistic fears and concerns of the founders & framers regarding foreign powers attempting to insert a "creature" not loyal to America (but to them) into the top majestry of the government and the position of Command in Chief of the United States Army.

The bias in favor of Obama forces his supporters to view such a view as legitimate and reasonable, regardless of the fact that such a non-citizen, non-immigrant father had no connection to the American nation at all. Nevertheless, being born within the magic American borders makes all babies Americans for some inexplicable reason or other, and all also eligible to be President. What a load of crap.

What they fail to grasp is that you can be a United States citizen and yet not be an "American". Wong Kim Ark was such a person. He was Chinese in his language, appearance, clothing, ancient heritage, diet, traditions and probably thinking as well. It was because of the total alienness of the Asians and the impossibility of them assimilating into white European-descended America, that the Chinese Exclusion Act was passed. That and the fact that they had emigrated in such tremendous numbers that they were distorting the demographics of entire regions of California.

The problem wasn't that they were immigrants, but that they were very alien immigrants, -very non-Western, non-democratic, non-Christian, and non-American. Their whole way of thinking was different. Children born to them were raised to be just like them but with some degree of assimilation resulting from

public schooling. They were U.S. citizens but not very American in the character of their identity and world-view.

It's the same with natives of the North Slope of Alaska and its other vast regions. Since Alaska was the property of the U.S. government, they, the Eskimo and Inuit peoples, -like other Native Americans, were viewed eventually to be legally U.S. citizens since Congress declared them to be so if they had no objection. Thus they become citizens but would not have considered themselves "Americans" because that carries a connotation that wouldn't apply to them.

The Vietnamese "boat-people" who fled their country by the tens of thousands after its fall to the North, eventually, (after years of limbo living in refugee camps) were admitted to the United States and granted U.S. citizenship. They thus became citizens and yet were thoroughly Vietnamese in every way, -not Americans. Similarly for the inhabitants of Guam and Puerto Rico who are U.S. Citizens.

Citizens? Yes. Americans? Not so much.

Conversely, one can be an American and not be a United States citizen. The children born here of illegal immigrants (raised here and educated in our schools) know no other country and possibly no other language than English. They are culturally American and only American and yet they are not United States citizens. They are solely citizens of their parents' homeland and yet might not even be registered there. That would make them stateless persons (without any nationality) who happen to be Americans. Barack Obama, by United States law (not policy) is just such a person.

His supposed native-birth does not provide the circumstances which the Supreme Court based its 14th Amendment Wong Kim Ark opinion on since his father was not a member of American society as a legally sanctioned immigrant.

He was instead merely a temporary foreign student with no attachment to America, and not under subjection to its political jurisdiction. Being subject solely to Great Britain, subjection to Washington could not flow through him to his son and thereby qualify him under the 14th Amendment merely by native-birth.

So there you have it, -two absurdities presenting themselves as being reasonable & true when they are neither. But the second or middle "theory" is both and is in fact not a theory but a fact. It is the immutable and everlasting principle of natural membership, -a principle that extends from families (parents and children) to tribes to nations. It is natural membership by birth, -by blood, -by inheritance, -not by borders, or territorial boundaries of any kind since they are all invented man-made designations that have nothing to do with natural membership. But they have everything to do with *legal* membership via permission of the State, -permission granted to those who have no right to membership since they are outsiders, or were born of outsiders on the soil of the insiders.

Since the first two theories de-legitimize Obama if he was not born within the U.S., the location of his birth is crucial to determining his eligibility by them, -while the truth is that the issue of birth location is irrelevant for natural citizens since their citizenship is inherited from parents who are citizens, -and not bestowed by law or government based on national borders. That being the case, it doesn't matter where Obama was born since he was not born of American parents.

Only an America mother & father produce natural American children. All others are born with "alienage" from a foreign parent, and thus are not *natural* citizens but instead are *legal* citizens by either statute if born abroad, or by the 14th Amendment if native-born.

But let's suppose that one or the other of the two false theories is right, and native-birth is crucial to eligibility, in that case it's vital to determine where he was born in order to get half-way to the truth regarding his ineligibility, because if he can't be presumed to have been native-born, then he can't be presumed to be eligible, although for the wrong reason. So what's the best way to ascertain the facts regarding his origin?

It's by reverse-engineering the timeline of his earliest years and drawing extrapolations from what little is known. That is done by working backwards. It requires a Sherlock Holmesian investigation based on few facts but strong logic, -like the case solved by "The Dog That Did Not Bark". Why did the dog not

bark during the murder? Because it must have known the murderer. Pure inescapable logical deduction. Let's now consider…

The Move That shouldn't Have Happened

The investigation begins with….
~a freedom of information request to the University of Hawaii which showed that Ann Dunham was registered for classes there in the spring of 1963, with the only earlier registration being in the fall of 1960. Where was her "husband" at that time?

He was in Boston attending Harvard after having completed his bachelor's degree in Hawaii. Had Ann been living with him in Hawaii up until his transfer to Harvard?

Hardly. In fact there is no evidence nor assumption that they ever lived together, regardless of the lie to the contrary in "Dreams From My Father" and Obama's fairy tale lie to the 2004 Democratic Convention. Instead, he was in Hawaii while Ann was in Seattle. When did she move from Hawaii to Seattle and why? Those questions are at the heart of the issue. His legitimacy hinges on them.

The Washington University records show her registered for fall classes on August 19, 1961. Her husband and her parents were still in Hawaii. Why wasn't she with them? There must have been a really, really good reason, or two, -or three. And there were. But before considering the "why" of her move, we need to consider the "how".

A single mother without reliance on a still non-existent welfare-state would have to work or be supported. Work would have been unlikely in 1961 since single mothers were not a significant part of the workforce in that era, and also because of her dual responsibility to attend to her college work and care for her baby, -nor was employment necessarily needed since she was an only child, and her parents could afford to take care of her expenses. So school and motherhood were probably the limits of her life in Seattle. It stands to reason that her parents were supporting her since that's what parents do for their only-child daughter.

That provokes several important questions, including; if she lived in their home in Hawaii, and gave birth there or in a hospital, why was she half an ocean away a mere week or two after her first birth? How and why would such a move take place and in such a time-frame? It makes no sense since it has no logical explanation.

Logic says that it wouldn't have happened, and asks: "If she was living in Seattle and being supported by her parents during the third week of August, why would one assume that she was not there during the third week of July? -and perhaps the previous month as well?"

Why is it necessary that she *not* be in Seattle during the third trimester of her pregnancy? Because it does not fit the presented narrative nor the abstract birth documentation images offered as proof of a Hawaiian birth.

But what if they are as false as the false narrative that Obama's parents lived together for two years? What if there were very good reasons for her to be in Seattle during the last few months of her pregnancy?

If there were no good reasons, then the Seattle scenario falls flat, but if there were, then the Hawaii scenario is deflated and rendered questionable, and even dubious. So let's consider the possible reasons.

Reason # 1. Reasonable Choice. A State Department officer responsible for deciding the request of Obama Sr. for an extension of his Visa wrote in his notes that they were considering adoption. That leads to the conclusion that it was decided that the best choice for her was to find an adoptive couple to take the baby right after delivery. That would be the logical choice given both of their circumstances (being young unemployed students). It also raises the question of why they would even get married if they had no child to raise and formed no family?

Reason # 2. Necessity. The Hawaiian population of middle-class, middle-aged married couples who were Negro and unable to have children or desiring or willing to accept a teen-mom's baby was essentially zero.

The 1960 Census found that people who were not White, Hawaiian (or Polynesian), or Chinese, Japanese, or Filipino was just 3.8 percent. Almost half of the population was under 21 at the time, so many of the 3.8% who happened to be Black and young, would not have been part of the eligible adoption-capable population, rendering it less than 1%, -with the

rest being either unmarried, unemployed, too old, or poor, or already having their own children. It is highly unlikely that an adoptive Negro couple existed in Hawaii, -hence the need to move to a bigger pond.

Reason # 3. Preference.
That pond was Ann's only long-term home town, (having suffered through five moves before Seattle) -the town where she spent all of her teen years. It can reasonably be presumed that she missed her old environment where she had friends and acquaintances, (while in Hawaii she was a total stranger). Home sickness may have been a factor.

Reason # 4. Opportunity. The Negro population of Seattle was much greater than that of Hawaii, (perhaps 800% greater) so chances that some "family services" non-profit organization could find her an adoptive couple would have been notably greater.

Reason # 5. Convenience. With her whole life and education still in front of her, it would not have been seen as desirable to "be punished" (as Obama puts it) with an unwanted and full-time baby-sitting, child-rearing job. The benefits of being single would have been very apparent.

Reason # 6. Face-saving. In 1960, in a pre-abortion, pre-women's liberation, pre-no-fault divorce world, the birth of a child outside of marriage carried a very strong social stigma (shame) and label (a *bastard*, -meaning illegitimate). Both Ann and her parents would have suffered damage to their public image if her out-of-wedlock pregnancy was visible for Hawaiian society to see.
A future birth to an unmarried couple could be addressed by some form of civil marriage process, but not conception outside of marriage. The appearance of a mulatto baby and a mother with no husband by her side nor living with her, (-and one of a taboo racial type) would have resulted in a certain amount of social stigma or shame. But if one moved away, that would eliminate that possibility regarding the opinion of one's neighbors and acquaintances, nor would pregnancy have to be explained. In that era the very word "pregnancy" was avoided, "with child" being used instead.

Miss Dunham's intimate relationship with Obama Sr. began at an unknown point. It may have begun earlier than the date of conception, and it may have continued many weeks after conception and early pregnancy. But it stopped at some point (assuming it was not a "one night only" fling) and that would probably have been after Ann was feeling very abnormal, and went to a medical office and had "the rabbit test" performed on her urine. It would have come back positive. Then they would have had to have had a talk.
Neither would have welcomed such news and would have thought that adoption would be the best way to handle it in order to avoid complicating their lives, but when that failed, marriage was the only acceptable course of action. Thus with pressure from her parents, and the possibility of deportation for impregnating an under-age American teen, no doubt he was compliant to their demand that he legitimize their conception via some sort of marriage. But at some point he had to have finally told her the truth about his Kenyan family.
Learning that her African paramour was a deceiving, adulterous bigamist who was already a father with another wife, after assuming he was single, available, and never married, might have hit her pretty hard, and shattered any fantasy world she might have been living in. It's likely that he kept it to himself before the birth, afraid that it wouldn't end well for him if he dropped such a bomb since bigamy has always been illegal in the United States.
Perhaps he never told her, but instead she found out via second-hard sources who had heard about or read about his background. He was in the newspapers in Hawaii (before the arrival of the Dunhams) as the only African student in Hawaiian history, so his story may have been known to others but not to them until the truth was conveyed after she gave birth.
After pregnancy was confirmed she became very focused and practical in choosing what she wanted to do in the future since without legal abortion as an available option that future was coming down the track straight at her.
So we see many reasons to leave Hawaii during her pregnancy, and they have few equal counter-arguments for staying besides the universal preference of a teen mom with a new-born to stick close to her own

mom for a month or more after her first birth. Since that did not happen, no known counter-facts render these deductions impossible, implausible nor unlikely simply because there *are* no known facts since the last evidence of her presence in Hawaii was in February of 1961, -three months after becoming pregnant (possibly on Halloween night after a libertine party that included lots of drinks and lowered inhibitions).

Do the facts then argue for a birth location in Seattle instead of Hawaii? Logical deduction argues otherwise because the Maricopa County Cold Case Posse investigation green-lighted by Sheriff Arpaio found that the microfilm record of the INS forms filled out by passengers of all international flights into Hawaii for the first week of August, 1961 was missing, (August 1-7) -while no other dates were missing in the months before or after, of which they had copies made under a FOIA request. No explanation was given as to why the microfilm covering the leading week of the month of August was missing.

The chance of that being pure coincidence, when such a thing simply doesn't happen, points to a deliberate removal of evidence of Ann Dunham flying from a foreign city into Hawaii on or before the 7th of August (assuming she gave birth on the 4th). Such a city could only be Vancouver, British Columbia. It is located just 140 miles from Seattle, -a two hour drive. I made that drive and back in one day in 1975 with others and we did not need a passport back then, just a driver's license, -which she had.

"The name 'Vancouver' previously referred to Vancouver Island, and it remains a common misconception that the city is located on the island, which it isn't. The Greater Vancouver area is the most populous in Western Canada. As of 2009, Port Metro Vancouver is the busiest and largest port in Canada, and the most diversified port in North America."

An attempt to find a qualified and interested adoptive couple in the greater Seattle area most likely also met with failure because of the size of the African-American population there. In this century it remains at around only 8%. It's unlikely that it was greater back in 1960, and more likely it was smaller. But the number of African-American middle-class couples who were infertile and/ or sought adoption would have been infinitesimal in size if any such couples even existed.

Ann, having discovered that there was no "market" for a "Negro" child, would have then had to look across the border to Vancouver as a final possibility. Thus it is highly possible and likely that she attempted to find an adoptive couple there by relying on the well-established Family Services of Greater Vancouver, "-a community-based not-for-profit organization providing social services across the lower mainland since 1928".

"Whether you are a birth parent thinking about placing your child for adoption in British Columbia or an adoptive parent wanting more information on how to adopt a child locally or from overseas, our team of experienced professionals can assist you through the adoption process."

But, after finding no takers in Hawaii and Seattle, she may have failed to mention to them, while speaking on the phone, who it was that fathered her child, and what race it was likely to be. No one at that point would want to walk right into further rejection, so she might not have been up-front with them. After all, why prejudice prospective adoptive parents in advance? Let them see the baby first and then maybe they might find they could accept it. Of course that would have come as a pretty big shock, so she would have had to have kept her baby by choice or by necessity.

Almost nothing can be determined about that period of her life except the known fact that she was in Seattle two weeks after giving birth. That leaves open the possibility that she was there two or three months before, as well as the possibility that her mother was with her in the last couple weeks of her pregnancy, and may have arranged many things for her, including adoption inquiries, -as any normal mother would.

If she (and possibly her mother) traveled to Vancouver due to a possibility that an interested couple there might adopt, and she gave birth there, then several known facts would make sense. The first is a reason why she was even in Seattle (two weeks after

the birth) instead of remaining in Honolulu with her parents and "husband". Common sense and facts-of-life allow arriving at certain conclusions about her transplanting herself back in Seattle. We can assume the following:

1. Return to Seattle may have been something that she desired but also something that wasn't backed by enough impetus to strive for until all adoption possibilities in Hawaii were exhausted, producing no interested couples.

2. Not attending classes during the winter semester left a lot of free time on her hands, which she probably filled with employment, -possibly as a probationary type of temporary worker, -maybe at one of her parents' place of employment, or nearby within walking distance.

3. During those winter-to-spring months she learned how to drive. Quote: "We know from interviews with her friends on Mercer Island in Washington State that Ann Dunham had acquired a driver's license by the summer of 1961 at the age of 17." She could have worked a distance from a parent's job location and borrowed that parent's car during the day to get there, -or been dropped of.

4. By working and living at home, she could have saved some money for the future, and used it for expenses related to moving to Seattle, along with all the support that her parents would have provided.

5. When it became evident that adoption in Hawaii was impossible, Seattle became the only alternative avenue to pursue. Ann would have wanted the certainty of having a waiting adoptive couple lined-up before birth instead of the uncertainty of being indefinitely entangled with a baby until fate finally opened that door for her, so moving to Seattle would have been necessary to find a couple before her delivery date. And she definitely would have preferred to be there in spring or early summer when the weather was nice and her old friends were out of school.

6. Making the move back to Seattle would have involved well determined timing. It wouldn't be good to be there too soon for no reason when she could be living with her parents' support in Hawaii, but she had to be there earlier enough before birth to find an adoptive couple, and before her pregnancy became too disabling for getting herself all set up with living accommodations.

7. With a driver's license and money from months of employment, along with financial support from her parents, she could have made the trip back to Seattle on her own, bought a car, set herself up, and sought out the help of an adoption agency if she did so around her seventh month of pregnancy.

8. Her mother would have joined her in mid to late July, and facilitated reaching out to the Vancouver family services organization for adoption help since by then it would have been rather clear that no prospective adoptive couples in Washington State were interested in her particular offer.

If they were given reason to hope that a Vancouver, B.C. couple was interested, and they traveled there, and she gave birth there, that would explain the fact of the missing INS microfilm record. She would have filled one out on the plane trip from Vancouver to Hawaii on probably August 7th, and it would have been seen in the microfilm.

It would also explain the fact that an official of the Hawaiian Dept. of Health stated two weeks before the surprise appearance of the long form Certificate of Live Birth pdf on April 27th, 2011 that what was seen in their archive was half-written and half typed, -meaning only one thing. It was a self-attesting affidavit written out by Ann Dunham (as required for all non-hospital births for which birth certificates were sought) and typed up by a clerk as a statement of the facts regarding the child.

Take a look at what it probably looked like:
http://h2ooflife.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/dunham_affidavit_simulation-b.pdf

[If the PDF version doesn't display properly (due to your device lacking its non-embedded fonts) then examine the jpg version instead:
http://h2ooflife.wordpress.com/2013/09/21/the-obama-vital-record-simulation/ Her handwriting should look like "hand writing" and not like print-font text.]

That means it wasn't a normal typed & signed Certificate of Live Birth from a hospital in Hawaii. That "sworn" statement by Obama's mother was treated as the self-attested truth given by an adult American citizen in the HDoH response to a telephone inquiry from

the State Department related to Obama Sr. and his Visa status (which furnished them the impression that Obama Jr. was born in Hawaii), but may not have fulfilled DoH requirements for corroboration of the stated "facts" from other persons or records as needed for the issuance of a birth certificate.

Her affidavit may have stated that her son was born at home in Hawaii, or it may have stated that he was born in Vancouver. She may have told the truth that he was born in Vancouver but without realizing that even though she was an American, it did not necessarily follow that her son was, -which was the case since she was several months too young for her citizenship to pass to her foreign-born child by law (something she would not have known).

That situation would have put him in a nationality limbo without any official papers from any government, -not Canada, nor Kenya, nor the United States.

If in her affidavit she stated honestly that her son was born in Canada (thinking that he would be a U.S. citizen through her) then she would have been met by disappointment when they informed her that only children born in Hawaii were eligible for a late birth certificate (one issued if not born in a hospital) and that the issue of a birth certificate was between her and the jurisdiction in which she gave birth.

They also would have informed her that the issue of the child's citizenship was between her and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It would have required a birth certificate or a properly witnessed and attested affidavit in order to process a claim of foreign birth to an American mother, but the INS could not have helped her with her child's citizenship issue since she was not 19 years old as required to convey her citizenship to him if he was born out of country. As a result, he would not have had a birth certificate nor a citizenship certificate, and would have been an American in a way, but not a U.S. Citizen.

And he never really became an American in the common and traditional sense which that appellation implies. Guam-ians are U.S. citizens but not really "Americans", nor are Hawaii-raised children having African fathers fitly described as American in any traditional sense since both Africa and Hawaii are so remote and unconnected to America and its roots, including places like Lexington, Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Atlanta, etc.

Two thirds of the population of Hawaii is Polynesian and Asians of the Pacific and Pacific Rim nations, and so Barry grew up to be a Pacific Ocean raised international citizen of the world, -with ties to Indonesia, Africa, and Hawaii, -but without any strong nationality ties to heartland American values and official United States citizenship.