



# Is the President *Eligible* to Serve?

**The issue at hand** is not whether President Obama is a US Citizen. The fact that he carries a US Passport stating his citizenship cannot be questioned. How he achieved his citizenship is certainly open to discussion. The question is rather, does the evidence provided by the President objectively establish



## Dr. Hannigan's Rebuttal

### Counter# 1:

The law is retroactive. The language clearly refers to "...an adult or legal parents of a minor child...shall issue a birth certificate for such adult or minor." If the law was for those born from 1982 onward, an adult could not be issued a COLB. Second, the law also refers to the Territorial time period "...living **without** the Territory or State of Hawaii." So again, in 1982 Hawaii was a state, and would not have referred to ty-3(abondv)8Td tr

2. **Whereas, the** above law [§38-17.8] was established in 1982, The 1955 Revised Laws of Hawaii (The Territorial Statutes) were in effect when the President was born in 1961.

While the above law [§38-17.8] was established in 1982, The 1955 Revised Laws of Hawaii (The Territorial Statutes) were in effect when the President was born in 1961. These laws established an even greater opportunity to register children than the current 1982 laws. Essentially, back then a child born outside a hospital, for example, in a private home, would have up to a full year after being born for the birth to be fully documented. However, the law states that the local registrar could initiate the birth certificate process “from anyone having knowledge of the birth” (see below). Any supplementary (a)-2(t)-5(e)9

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/24948817/Int-Motion-with-HI-Territorial-Law-57>

Dr. Hannigan's rebuttal –

In this argument, the actual pertinent sections are ignored. While I concede that the 1955 law did not make provision for those born out of state as the current 1998 law does. I argue this makes no difference. In the 1955 law, a provision for unattended births

Additionally, it is clear that an incomplete birth report can be filed without being considered "delayed" or "altered." This means that the filing for a birth certificate would not be held up for the supplementary report, allowing the certificate to be initiated. This is a critical point when considering the newspaper birth announcements as discussed in item #4.

The laws listed above can be found at the link below. The 1955 law is attached as a motion of judicial notice of this law, with a pending lawsuit in the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals, filed on 1/7/2010. Scroll to the bottom to see the attachment.  
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/24948817/Join-Motion-with-HI-Territorial-Law-57>

born in a hospital as he claims, would simply be a no brainer to release the Long Form. These arguments are sufficient to ~~defeat~~ rebutted, and Prima Facie acceptance must be dropped, and thus, rebuttals must now be answered.

Consider the example of Sun Yat-sen. **“In March 1904, he obtained a Certificate of Hawaiian Birth,<sup>[9]</sup> issued by the Territory of Hawaii, stating he was born on November 24, 1870 in Kula, Maui”**

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sun\\_Yat-sen](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sun_Yat-sen)  
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/9830547/Sun-Yat-sen-Certification-of-Live-Birth-in-Hawaii>

However, it just so happens that Sun Yat-sen is an actual historical figure who was a Chinese political activist known as the “Founding Father of Republic of China. Most notably, Sun Yat-sen was born on 12 November 1866 Guangzhou prefecture, Guangdong province (26 km or 16 miles north of Macau), in the Empire of the Great Qing China” He lived in exile in Hawaii.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sun\\_Yat-sen](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sun_Yat-sen)

The Territorial laws of Hawaii (BC4) allowed for this fraud in 1909. The same opportunity for mistakes is present in the 1955 laws, which also allowed for unattended births (BC2-BC4). Additionally, it appears obvious that the laws enacted in 1911 were in use before 1911





If the Long Form were simply provided, and it corroborated the President's claim, the discussion about his birthplace would be over (though not the objection to his non-citizen father). However, if the Long Form contained an extended supplementary report documenting extenuating birth circumstances, and/or affidavits supporting a Honolulu birthplace, then that would confirm that he is lying, and it would certainly mandate further investigation. Even Chris Mathews agrees that it is time to show the long form:  
[http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2010/12/27/chris\\_mathews\\_why\\_doesnt\\_obama\\_just\\_release\\_the\\_birth\\_certificate.html](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2010/12/27/chris_mathews_why_doesnt_obama_just_release_the_birth_certificate.html)

However, now that the new Governor of HI (Abercrombie) is unable to find the President's long form birth certificate, Chris Mathews has changed his tune and falsely states that it's not needed because now we have "new" birth certificates.

<http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=258637>

The media is now getting desperate. Obviously, the 1961 Birth Certificate is not a new one. It needed to exist in 1961 if Obama was born in HI. If it can't be found, the correct question is why not. Mathews blows off this little issue by say "now they have new ones."

If the long form does not exist, or if it generates more questions, even ardent Obama supporters will want to know the answers as well. " argument, is an intellectually unsatisfying as it is non-sequitur. It is a classic law in reasoning known as Avoiding the Question. The question is, "Why not release the vault copy long form that will objectively support the President's claim that he was born in Kapi'olani Hospital in Honolulu?"

The actual answer the counter is looking for is "We don't know, because they (we) really don't. This simple question challenges the coherency and validity of the President's claim, and in light of the complete inadequacy of providing a COLB as proof of a natural birth location, and thus eligibility, the question deserves a more thorough response than "it won't make any difference". And, according to the newly elected Gov. Abercrombie the COLB issue "has a political implication for 2012 that we simply cannot have. This issue could cost him the Presidency."

[http://www.staradvertiser.com/editorials/20110118\\_This\\_is\\_a\\_collaborative\\_endeavor.html](http://www.staradvertiser.com/editorials/20110118_This_is_a_collaborative_endeavor.html)

I cannot speak for others, however, my case is resolved with the Long Form, because it, and it alone, can legally affirm if the President was born at Kapiolani

The fact that Hawaii issues a passport from the COLB confuses the issue, so I address this below as well. Please note that having a passport in no way affirms that one has Natural Born status.

<http://www.sccgov.org/portal/site/rec/agencyarticle?path=%2Fv7%2FCounty%20ClerkRecorder%20%28DEP%29%2FPassports&contentId=5cf1bb3166b34010VgnVCM2200049dc4a92>

***President Obama's Birth announcement***

I hesitate to bring forward the following point challenging the credibility of the COLB, because the State of Hawaii website which supported the point was ~~unsubstantiated~~ <sup>unsubstantiated</sup> and ~~unsubstantiated~~ <sup>unsubstantiated</sup> has since been removed or modified. I used these links in the past, but the Homeland

official registrar's office, so the constraints of traveling to Honolulu from the remaining islands, along with Hawaii's Territorial Transition to Statehood, made this law necessary.

Dr. Hannigan's rebuttal:

The implication that the counter is trying to establish is that Ann Dunham got her Passport in 1965, which is after the President was born, thus suggesting that there is no way for Obama to have been born outside of the country. This is a nice try but the actual Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) passport record Cover Letter explains that while the documents therein reference Stanley Ann Dunham's 1965 passport application, the original application document could not be found as "it was destroyed in the 1980s."

Therefore, there is no ground for the statement "The record starts..." or New passport Application (inferred). You see, if the original 1965 application was available, we could ascertain for what purpose the application had been made. A passport application could mean an application for Amendment, such as name change, for Renewal or Extension. The destroyed 1965 passport application could just as easily be one of several amendments or renewals of her original passport. Because the cover letter also states that "many passport applications from that time period were destroyed," this could also include any 1960-1965 applications, renewals or extensions she might have had, but are now not available. Since this information is missing, the argument that she never travelled prior to moving to Indonesia, cannot be supported.

We do know that the 1965 application was not to change her name to Soetoro, as she did that in July 1967. The above referenced website suggests that she "kept her name until she filed the amendment" in 1967. Well, how would they know that?

It is not likely that the July 1965 Application was for a original Passport. The Passport was issued four months after she was married Soetoro. If it were for a new application, her name would have been Soetoro, but that can't be because she amended the 1965 passport.











Supreme Court who had disbarred him for 5 years based on his perjury conviction.

So, perhaps one should not be so quick here to claim another (tea party)

The President's birth certificate concern arose in June 2008 BEFORE the November Presidential election which is why the COLB was released in July of 2008. Also, note, before Tea Party activists.

<http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=66787>

7. Whereas No standing in courts

However, all of the courts have ruled exclusively on the basis of "Standing" alone. All of the judges have ruled that the plaintiffs do not have the right to ask this question because they have not been "harmed, personally," more than the public in general has been harmed. Not one court has ruled based on the merits of the case. Some courts have thrown the cases out as frivolous rather than rule on the arguments; other courts refused to hear the cases at all. I simply ask, if "We the People" do not have Standing to question whether the Constitution has been upheld, who does?

Dr. Hannigan's rebuttal: Few cases have been ruled as frivolous. One such was Cook v. Goode et al in which U.S. District Judge Clay Land sanctioned Atty. Orly Taitz \$20,000 and ordered her not to bring any more such cases into his courtroom. Kerchner vs. Obama was tossed out for lack of standing by Judge Dolores Sloviter. Interestingly enough, when Atty. Mario Apuzzo appealed the ruling:

For WorldNetDaily, Bob Unruh reported: "But Apuzzo had explained to the court



9.

certificateThe President's lack of action leaves the question open. Frankly, I find it appalling that the States' and Federal legislature did not do their due diligence to prove out Sen. Obama's eligibility as was requested in June

## Minor Additional Comments:

### *Citizenship*

In the late 1960's, under military dictator Suharto, every student in Indonesia had to carry a government ID card, a Kartu Tanda Penduduk or KTP, which to obtain, one had to officially establish to the military government one's nationality and religion. One could not simply claim to be whatever nationality or religion was convenient at the moment. The AP secured and published a copy of Barack II's registration for school at Fransiskus Assisi Catholic (Elementary) School in Jakarta. It had "Indonesian" for nationality and "Islam" for religion. Had he been any other nationality besides Indonesian, he could only have attended school in Indonesia at the

have posters. However, it is tolerant to point this out while ignoring and excusing the racists among the liberal wing of the Democratic Party, NAACP and The New Black Panthers?

As you know the NAACP recently passed a motion to charge the Tea Party with racism (without proof) and to demand that they remove racist from their movement.  
<http://www.azcentral.com/news/articles/2010/07/13/20100713naacp0713.html>

However, they failed to make any motion regarding the New Black Panther movement (specifically party leader King Samir Shabazz) who, not only was found guilty of voter intimidation  
([http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2010/07/12/team\\_obama\\_turns\\_blind\\_eye\\_to\\_voter\\_intimidation\\_106267.html](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2010/07/12/team_obama_turns_blind_eye_to_voter_intimidation_106267.html))

Additionally, Shabazz called on black men to get rid of their white women and begin the "killing of White Crackers and their babies"  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=neGbKHyGuHU&feature=pyv&ad=3265020430&kw=black%20panther>

Somehow, in the same motion, the NAACP failed to censure the Democratic Party and ask for their rats. It is a point of fact that in America, the charge of racist only goes one way. Some recent examples:

"He [Reid] was wowed by Obama's oratorical gifts and believed that the country was ready to embrace a black presidential candidate, especially one such as Obama -- 'light-skinned' African American 'with no Negro dialect, unless he wanted to have one,' " Halperin and Heilemann said.

[http://articles.cnn.com/2010/01-09/politics/obama.reid\\_1\\_john-](http://articles.cnn.com/2010/01-09/politics/obama.reid_1_john-)

Finally, you just might see left liberal operatives begin infiltrating the Tea Party movement with racist signs to help cast the Tea Party as a racist group.

**<http://www.examiner.com/tea-party-in-new-york/crash-the-tea-party-founder-outwitted-by-foes>**

I did a YouTube search on Tea Party Racism which revealed nothing except people (African, and Anglo Americans) speaking, singing and supporting one another in their view believe, this

investigations which release reports and findings. A Conspiracy Theorist must argue against "institutional analysis." The Certificate issue has not been institutionally investigated. There are no findings and additionally, it has been ignored by the courts and the media (including Fox News), ergo, no conspiracy theory.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conspiracy\\_theory](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conspiracy_theory)

Finally, true conspiracy theories can never be proven because the institution is in the position of having to prove a negative. If you do not have the alien bodies, how can you prove that you do not have alien bodies? Since such a fallacy cannot be resolved



## **I am not the only one...**

There are 11 states that are in various stages of amending their election laws to include requirements that presidential candidates provide affidavits of their meeting the eligibility requirements and provided an original birth certificate or other vital records to support their eligibility. If only one of these states (Arizona) passes this change into law, my opinion that the President will NOT run for a second term to avoid the release of whatever he is hiding.

<http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=261901>

A CNN Poll released August 4<sup>th</sup> 2010 (Pres. Obama's 4<sup>th</sup> Day), shows that only 42% of Americans think the President was definitely born in the U.S.

[http://instruct.westvalley.edu/hannigan/CNN\\_Poll.pdf](http://instruct.westvalley.edu/hannigan/CNN_Poll.pdf)

Dr. Hannigan's reply

I'm not sure what to say to this. If weren't for those darn "We the People...people"

Not even four in 10 people across America believe President Obama's narrative about being born in Hawaii, according to a new poll. A new 60 Minutes/Vanity Fair poll shows that only 39 percent of respondents believe Obama was born in Hawaii as he wrote in his book. The magazine boasted, "A whopping 63 percent – nearly two-thirds of us – went out on a limb and stated for the record that we believe our President was born in the States. It's enough to make you proud to be an American – or 63 percent proud, at any rate." But that included those who say they believe he was born in Kansas or some other unknown state, which still would conflict with Obama's narrative.

When asked to explain why President Obama's taxes were filed with a Social Security number (I-10(h-2(e b)-4(e)-8hh)

Dr. Hannigan's rebuttal:

This issue adds to the mystery of who these Presidents are. He has never been fully vetted and that his objective history is hidden from view.

**A US Senator and over 3 dozen state lawmakers want proof of Obama eligibility  
Proposal would demand state officials independently verify information.  
<http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=178321>**

Dr. Hannigan's rebuttal: Okay, but I predict that either the actual Long Form will be released or the President will not run for a second term.

**President Obama's Grandmother affirms that she was present in Kenya at Obama's birth – see affidavit.  
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/18010847/BeverlyObamaKweli-ShuhubiaAffidavit>**

<http://www.obamaconspiracy.org/wpcontent/uploads/2009/03/obamatranscriptlulu109.pdf>

Dr. Hannigan's rebuttal:

The link I used is a legal affidavit from the translator who was present with Sarah Obama at the time of the interview. This transcription provided by the counter response is translated after the fact and in a private context. In the affidavit linked to, the translator insists that Sarah Obama affirmed twice that she was present when the President was born:

“Bishop McRae asked Ms. Obama specifically, ‘Were you present when your grandson Barack Obama was born in Kenya?’ She was asked to her in translation twice, and both times she specifically replied ‘Yes’. It appeared Ms. Obama’s relatives and her grandson, handling the translation, had obviously been versed to counter such facts with the purported information from the American news media that Obama was born in Hawaii. then this K-1 (on 15 T-4e)4( ) ] Tr in tracou



The Washington Post and Wikipedia (presumably at the suggestion or with the approval of people associated with Barack Obama) now claim that he was born in Kapiolani Hospital, even though Kapiolani Hospital refuses to confirm or deny the truth of this statement or to provide a copy of a hospital birth certificate or record. See the two identical news reports screen shots except that the 2<sup>nd</sup> one has the name of hospital changed." (quotes added)

<http://www.safeguardourconstitution.com/thehardfacts.html>





