RECEIVED

NOV 06 2008

NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RE: Joseph S. Haas, citizen v.s. The N.H. Democrat Party Case #

Dear Members [5 by R.S.A. Ch. 665:1]:

In accordance with RSA Ch. 665:5, II would you please set up a day, time and place for a paragraph II hearing toward your meeting that "shall" take place "on the fourth Monday in November" regarding this RSA Ch. 665:7

Filing Dispute that the declaration "of candidacy filed" on:

by:

for Barack Obama, as the Democrat in the race for the

White House as President of the United States of America, in the "over" part of sentence #1 of 2 herein this 665:7, has FAILed to "conform with the law."

Reference is made to paragraph #3 on page 1 of Devvy Kidd's "OBAMA'S GAMBLE" website of http://www.newwithviews.com/Devvy/kidd408.htm of Oct. 30th, 2008 that "While the Secretary of State certifies candidates for the ballot, each political party is legatly responsible for choosing the candidate they wish to place on the ballot." (emphasis added). There needing to be proof presented when called for, and since there is a dispute per kidd409 website of Nov. 3rd '08, that's what this petition is about: "OBAMA MUST STAND UP NOW OR STEP DOWN" http://www.newswithviews.com/Vieira/edwin84.htm of Oct.29 '08, [see also kidd411 website] onto your finding so that the four N.H. Electors can make a vote on Mon., Dec. 15th, 2008 that is an informed vote and in compliance with their RSA 92:2 oath of office.

Yours truly,

Thursday, November 6th, 2008 @ 4: 30 o'clock p.m.

pc: The N.H. Democrat Party 2½ Beacon Street Concord, N.H. 03301 603: 225-6899

Joseph S. Haas
P. O. Box 3842
Concord, N.H. 03302
603: 848-6059 (cell phone)







Additional Titles

OBAMA'S GAMBLE: POSSESSION NINE TENTHS OF THE LAW

By: Devvy October 30, 2008 © 2008 - NewsWithViews.com

Other Devvv **Articles:**

Vote Fraud: What They Aren't Telling You

Forced Mental Your Children

How the IRS Lies to **Employers About** Withholding

NWV Store
Books
DVDs
Merchandise
Writers
Advertise
Submit Story
Contact NWV
Donate to NWV
About NWV
NWV Home

More Devvv **Articles** While the disgraced mainstream media continues to ignore the constitutional crisis regarding Obama's birth certificate, we the people will not be deterred from getting the truth.

Over the past two weeks I have received thousands of emails (which I cannot respond to one on one) from enraged Americans over Judge R. Barclay Surrick's decision in Berg v. Obama, et al (see here). Americans are energized and faxed their state officials demanding Obama's eligibility for ballot qualification be investigated. The responses from these elected Health Screening for public servants all provided basically the same response, here are just two:

> "While the Secretary of State certifies candidates for the ballot, each political party is legally responsible for choosing the candidate they wish to place on the ballot." Sincerely, Legislative and Constituent Affairs Secretary of State (California)

"The Florida Department of State does not have investigative or enforcement authority to ensure that major parties candidates are properly qualified to be President of the United States. The U.S. Constitution establishes the qualifying requirements for President. Under Florida law, the way in which a major party's candidate is placed on the ballot is that the state executive committee of each political party submits its slate of presidential electors for its candidate before September 1st of each presidential election year; then, by law, the names of candidates are printed on the ballot. Those candidates are not required to provide any documents to the State that they meet the qualifications for office.

"The Florida Secretary of State performs only a ministerial function. So, the Secretary has no authority or duty to look beyond the filing documents to determine if a candidate is eligible. If a candidate (or the party in the case of a major political party nominating someone as a Presidential candidate) files the necessary paperwork, which papers are complete on their face, the Secretary must qualify the candidate. Any challenge to the qualifications of a U.S. Presidential candidate should be made in a court of competent jurisdiction." Gary J.

As Dr. Edwin Vieira pointed out in my conversation with him yesterday, an individual applying for a hunting license in Virginia must provide a real birth certificate, but an applicant for president of these united States of America doesn't have to prove citizenship?





Tuu. 11/6/2008 1:05 PM Holland, Assistant General Counsel, Florida Department of State

As Dr. Edwin Vieira pointed out in my conversation with him yesterday, an individual applying for a hunting license in Virginia must provide a real birth certificate, but an applicant for president of these united States of America doesn't have to prove citizenship? Excellent point and it appears the states of the Union are willing to allow the DNC to defraud their citizens the right to vote for a legally eligible candidate because they fear riots by a certain race of voters.

The idiom, possession is nine tenths of the law, is EXACTLY what Obama is gambling on right now. If he can stall until November 4th when vote fraud will "elect him" if he's the choice of the shadow government, Obama figures he's home free. No doubt Obama is feeling empowered from the extreme bias by corporate media with one newspaper in New Mexico already declaring him the "winner." In his bloated arrogance, Obama believes that if he's "declared" the winner, he can just waltz into the Oval office because law enforcement, public officials and federal judges are scared black Americans will burn cities to the ground. In my opinion, they do an injustice to Americans of color. No doubt there are areas in some major cities which have the potential to go off the track, but not everyone of a certain race believes riots are the way to resolve an issue.

Obama's gamble is that since this big hoax called an election is already underway with early voting, if he "wins" and is sworn into office, possession is nine tenths of the law and the hell with the Constitution. He's now a step closer. One of the nine lawsuits filed at the state level has now been thrown out:

Judge tosses lawsuit over Obama citizenship

SEATTLE — "A King County judge said Monday that a lawsuit challenging Sen. Barack Obama's qualifications to be president "may be a positive idea," but threw it out because the law clearly prevents the secretary of state from getting involved.

"Washington's Secretary of State Sam Reed does not have the authority to inquire into Obama's birth certificate and determine if it is valid or not, said Superior Court Judge John Erlick. Therefore, Reed is obliged to accept the nomination and keep Obama's name on the state ballot, Erlick said. Doing any external fact-finding "is not authorized by the state constitution or state law or administrative rule," he said. "The 2008 general election is already in progress; ballots have been issued and a substantial number of voters have voted," said the order signed by Erlick."

Obama was in Hawaii from the afternoon of October 23rd to the morning of October 25th, ostensibly to visit his ailing grandmother. Hawaii is also the state Obama claims is his birthplace. In June, Obama released a copy of a birth certificate which was printed off a laser printer. It carries no state seal and cannot be verified.

While Obama was in Hawaii last week, he could have simply gone down to the Hawaii Department of Health on Friday, October 24th, requested a copy of the state sealed birth certificate, gone outside where the world's media would be waiting since they follow him everywhere and presented the birth certificate for the world to see. Over, done, finished.

Instead, Obama flies back to the mainland leaving the issue unresolved. WND reports they were told by government authorities in Kenya that all documents concerning Obama were under seal until after the U.S. presidential election on

November 16, 2008. What's the big secret? Perhaps to black mail Obama down the road should he succeed in getting sworn in would be my guess. After all, Obama has a very cozy relationship with Odinga.

Click Here to Expose Matt Drudge

Advertisement

No sooner did Obama's plane lift off the ground to return stateside, Hawaii "Gov. Linda Lingle has placed the candidate's birth certificate under seal and instructed the state's Department of Health to make sure no one in the press obtains access to the original document under any circumstances." The State of Hawaii says a birth certificate can be requested by the individual, authorized family members, authorized legal representative or by a court of law; see here.

When Phil Berg filed his lawsuit over two months ago, Obama could very easily have requested and obtained a 'vault certificate'. That would have ended all this speculation and lawsuits to get to the truth. Instead, his high paid lawyers, along with defendants DNC and FEC, fought to get Phil's lawsuit thrown out of court.

Obama's campaign has been the most corrupt of my lifetime, surpassing even the Clinton duo. According to an investigation done by Kenneth R. Timmerman (see here): "More than half of the whopping \$425.9 million Barack Obama has raised has come from small donors whose names the Obama campaign won't disclose." I predict once investigations are underway by the FBI, we will see just how much money came in from unlawful sources - especially foreign donors. Obama doesn't care at this point, he only need make it to coronation day and pay FEC fines later. After all, it's not his money.

This brings me around to the issue of possible crimes being committed by both Gov. Lingle and Obama. If Gov. Lingle has seen a birth certificate or has been told by an official at the Hawaii Department of Health that "a" document will prove Obama does not meet eligibility requirements under Art. II, Sec.1 of the U.S. Constitution and she remains silent, is she guilty of defrauding the American people? She is the chief law enforcement officer for the State of Hawaii. If Gov. Lingle knows Obama is committing fraud by presenting himself as a natural born U.S. Citizen, isn't she obligated under the law to expose such fraud?

I consulted with a friend who is a constitutional attorney with 30 years experience in federal court rooms about this very issue. If Obama has knowingly withheld his legal citizenship status in order to run for the presidency and has collected nearly a half billion dollars by perpetrating fraud, can he be charged and indicted? Obama's campaign released digitally scanned image of his birth certificate to kill any more inquiries into his citizenship. The 'image' is not proof and Obama knows it and so does his high paid legal representatives. During this period and as I write this column, Obama continues to solicit money. This is my friend's expert legal analysis:

"In the late 70s and early 80s, federal prosecutors often sought to indict and convict corrupt state officials by contending that such officials engaged in a "scheme to defraud" the citizens of a particular state of those public servants' honest services. But in 1987, the Supreme Court held in McNally v. United States, 483 U.S. 350 (1987), that the mail and wire fraud statutes could not be stretched to encompass such a legal theory. In response, Congress adopted 18 U.S.C. §1346 to cure this defect in statutory language. Lots of corrupt local officials have been indicted and

convicted for using the mails and wires to carry out a "scheme to defraud" the public via their "dishonest services." See, as an example, United States v. Frega, 179 F.3d 793 (9th Cir. 1999).

SECRETARY OF STATE

Tom DeWeese **CLICK HERE** Advertisement

"A great controversy now exists regarding the constitutional qualifications of Barack Hussein Obama, aka Barry Soetoro, aka Barry Obama, aka Barack Dunham, aka Barry Dunham, to become President. The Constitution requires that any candidate for the office of President must be a natural born citizen. Yet, there is abundant evidence that this candidate is not natural born and thus Kunqualified for that office. To address this specific problem, the Obama campaign has posted on its web site an alleged certified copy of his birth certificate (certificate of live birth?), thus clearly via use of interstate wires informing the American public that Obama does indeed possess the qualifications for President. It cannot be denied that this statement constitutes a loud proclamation and representation that Obama is qualified, and this representation undoubtedly plays a substantial role in raising funds for Obama. It is reported that just in September alone, Obama raised some 150 million dollars from the American public.

"The wire fraud statute, 18 U.S.C. §1343, provides as follows:

"Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of wire, radio, or television communication in interstate or foreign commerce, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both. If the violation affects a financial institution, such person shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both.

As Dr. Edwin Vieira wrote in his legal analysis, October 29,

"Berg v. Obama may very well end up in the Supreme Court. Yet that ought to be unnecessary. For Obama's moral duty is to produce the evidence of his citizenship sua sponte et instanter. Otherwise, he will be personally responsible for all the consequences of his refusal to do so.

"Of course, if Obama knows that he is not "a natural born Citizen" who never renounced his American citizenship, then he also knows that he and his henchmen have perpetrated numerous election-related frauds throughout the country-the latest, still-ongoing one a colossal swindle targeting the American people as a whole. If that is the case, his refusal "to be a witness against himself" is perfectly explicable and even defensible on the grounds of the Fifth Amendment. Howsoever justified as a matter of criminal law, though, Obama's silence and inaction will not obviate the necessity for him to prove his eligibility for "the Office of President." The Constitution may permit him to "take the Fifth;" but it will not suffer him to employ that evasion as a means to usurp the Presidency of the United States."

I urge you to read Edwin's full column because he shreds Judge Surrick's absurd decision.

Lawsuit update (Hawaii), October 28, 2008: Andy Martin, J. D. and Professor of Law (Adj.):

Dear Judge Ayabe and Hon. Mark Bennett, Attorney General: "I spoke with the court's judicial assistant on Monday, and today I am FedExing the original Order to Show Cause back to the court so I can obtain a new date. The court has indicated it will not hear me by phone on November 7th, so I must purchase airline tickets and clear several days to make a personal trip to Honolulu. That is a complicated process, particularly given the approaching holiday season. If I am assigned a new hearing date on October 29th (Wednesday), I can arrange to appear in person at a hearing in Honolulu on November 11th-14th (later in the week, Thursday or Friday, is better for me). I am also available November 18-21."



As you can see, this is well after the massive vote fraud "election" coming up in a few short days.

I spoke briefly with Phil Berg yesterday. He and his colleague did not file their Writ of Certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court due to time constraints, but will file today. He also mentioned some actions post Nov. 4th, but until we see the "declared" outcome I don't feel I should comment on that right now. Phil also reinforced that there is no doubt in his mind that there is no birth certificate which will prove Obama's citizenship and the Governor of Hawaii should be more careful with her choice of words.

Never Miss Another BIG Story

While I wanted to send a fax, the FBI operators wouldn't give me a number, so I sent a letter, along with Edwin's column (printer friendly) to James Burrus, Chief Investigator of Election Fraud, Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover Building, 935 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20535-0001. Because time is of the essence, I sent it over night mail; it should arrive in Burrus' hands by Monday. My letter was short and to the point: Barack Obama refuses to provide proof of citizenship, which he could have done in less than an hour when he was in Hawaii last week. This issue is building into a constitutional crisis and if no one else will investigate, then the FBI has a duty to determine if Obama is committing federal crimes as outlined above. If enough pressure is brought to bear on the FBI, let them issue a subpoena for whatever documents are being held by the Hawaii Department of Health and then let's see what Obama has to say.

History:

- 1 Thomas Jefferson's Account of the Declaration of Independence
- 2 The Declaration of Independence

© 2008 - NewsWithViews.com - All Rights Reserved

Printer Friendly

E-mail This Page

Sign Up For Free E-Mail Alerts E-Mails are used strictly for NWVs alerts, not for sale

60%

- 001_OhamaComplaint.pdf
- 001_ObamaMemSupportTRO082108.pdf
- 001_ObamaMotionfor FRO.pdf
- 001_ObamaTempOrder.pdf
- 001_PressReleaseObama082108.pdf
- 002_Stanley Ann Soctoro H1 Divorce Docket pdf
- 003 Barry Soctoro Indonesia School Record.pdf
- 005_Obama_ARDC.pdf
- 008_obama-citizenship-lawsuit-info-sheet_format.pdf
- 010 2008 DNC CALL pdf
- 011 ObamaCrimes Press Release 09 94 2008 Parties Served.pdf
- 013 Obama Return of Service on 09042008.pdf
- 015_Ohama Press Release 09 10 2008 pdf
- 015_OhamaMotExpedDdiscovery09082008Pacer.pdf
- 016 Obama Complaint from Pacer pdf
- 016_Obama Memorandum in support of TRO from Pacer.pdf
- 016 Obama Motion for TRO from Pacer pdf
- 022 ObamaCrimes Press Release 09 24 2008 pdf
- 023_Ohama DNC Motion to dismiss.pdf
- 024_Berg v Obama Berg Opposition to Def Motions to Dismiss complete pdf
- 026 ObamaCrimes Berg Files Answer Confident Obama and DNC Motion to Dismiss will be Defeated Obama Press Release 09 29 2008 pdf
- 028 Obama Motion for Leave and First Amended Complaint pdf
- 029 Obama Defense request for Protective Order re Discovery pdf
- 029 Obama Crimes, com Press Release 10 06 08 Reaction to Obama Filing Motion for Protective Order pdf
- 030_ObamaBergOpposProtecOrder100808.pdf
- 038 Motion for Expedited Ruling on Plaintiff Order re Req for Admissions Admitted pdf
- 038 Obama Motion for Order deeming Request for Admissions Admitted.pdf
- 038_ObamaCrimes.com Press Release 10.21.08 Obama DNC Admit All Allegationsof Federal Court Lawsuit.pdf
- 041 Motion for Exp Ruling Hearing or Resolution re Summary Judgment Motion 102208.pdf
- 041_Obama Plaintiff Motion for Summary Judgment against Obama the DNC pdf
- 045 Obama Judge Surrick Ruling 10 24 2008 pdf
- 045 Press Release 10 25 2008 Berg Appealing pdf
- 047_MEMORANDUM and ORDER pdf
- 047_order pending motions dismissed pdf
- 049 Press Release 10 30 2008 Berg Filing Injunction to Stav Presidential Election pdf
- 050_Affidavit of Bishop Ron McRae.pdf
- 050 Affidavit of Reverend Kweli Shuhubia pdf
- 050_Application to Justice David H. Souter for a stay of the Presidential Elections.pdf
- 050_Exhibit Charter Schools Rainbow Edition Newsletter.pdf
- 050_Exhibit Plaintiff Request for Admissions to Obama pdf
- 050 Exhibit The Star Bulletin Ohama born in different hostpital pdf
- 050 Exhibits for Affidavit of Bishop Ron McRae pdf
- 050_US Supreme Court Wrst of Certiorari_pdf

Devvy Kidd authored the booklets, Why A Bankrupt America and Blind Loyalty; 2 million copies sold. Devvy appears on radio shows all over the country, ran for Congress and is a highly sought after public speaker. Devvy belongs to no organization.

She left the Republican Party in 1996 and has been an independent voter ever since. Devvy isn't left, right or in the middle; she is a constitutionalist who believes in the supreme law of the land, not some political party. Her web site (www.devvy.com) contains a tremendous amount of information, solutions and a vast Reading Room.

Devvy's website: www.devvy.com

Before you send Devvy e-mail, please take the time to check the FAQ section on her <u>web site</u>. It is filled with answers to frequently asked questions and links to reliable research sources.

E-mail is: devvyk@earthlink.net

Home

6 of 6

11/6/2008 2:42 PM

271 6316

http://www.newswithviews.com/Devvy/kidd409.htm

bevvy Kidd -- Stop the election: accurate vote count impossible, Part 1

MIIMARSHIOM CLICK FOR bogus "original" birth certificate. "Martin won a stunning victory (HONOLULU) (November 1, 2008) Internet powerhouse Andy Martin has ignited a firestorm in Hawaii over Barack Obama's backed his assertion that there was an original, "typewritten, 1961" birth certificate, called a "Certificate of Live Birth" or officials retrieved and examined the document after Martin 'COLB" in Hawaii, that no one has previously seen. Hawaii

filed a lawsuit seeking access to the historic 1961 original." His





The issue of what kind of birth certificate constitutes proof of citizenship is the most asked question in my mail box. Philip J. Berg's Assistant, Lisa, has done the research and provides us November 2, 2008 follow up is here.

with this clarification:

registered, the original foreign birth certificate is placed and stored and the State Department of Health and a Confification of born abroad, you must take the original foreign birth certificate to Department of Health in the State which your birth is being the Health Department, a birth certificate is created; If you are certificate is issued by the doctor, the mother must register the "Once you are born, the hospital transmits the information to home, a doctor must check the woman and child, then a birth Live Birth is created. If you are born at home, then you must register that birth with the medical records (even births at doctors birth certificate of the child with the Department of Health) "I spoke with the Director of Records in Hawaii, he explained to three way) the above procedures. So yes, everyone in the United States and other countries (unless you were born in a field and both (name withheld for privacy) and myself (we were on a never sought medical care) has a vault version of a birth

Details here

the best.

"On another note, in 1961 the Hawaii birth certificates are black of Live birth is nothing more than stating, not proving you were which folks are not aware of, unless they asked. A Certification of Health changed formats and now offer a short version and a born, it does not prove your citizenship status or anything else. Hospital in Hawaii is called a "Certificate of Live Birth" not a Certification of Live Birth (COLB that Obema is using, take or and type written, this is true. In 2001, the Hawaii Departmen not) so there are differences in the wording of the document long version. The short version, if the birth occurred in a certificate.

abroad, which are registered in the Hawaii Department of Health. But there is more: On the bottom left of a Certificate of live birth is the words "recorded" which is the date the hospital "Now, the Certification of Live Birth is issued for foreign births ransmitted the information for the production of the birth sertificate or the Certificate of Live Birth.

Donate to NWV About NWV NWV Home

(<u>organisms</u>)to Your Credito

11. 16 (de 1

You Are 1 Slave

Articles More Devvy

Friday afternoon (October 31st) when the State of Hawai

Derud ंगकी महरूप कि

ACCURATE VOTE COUNT

IMPOSSIBLE

PART 1 of 2

STOP THE ELECTION:

Additional Titles





Stanley Ann Dunhar married Lolo Sector Muslim Indonesian

established that

must do the day after this gigantic hoax tomorrow, I would like to give an update on the lawsuits regarding Obama's citizenship

Before I get into the massive vote fraud and what ALL of us

© 2008 - NewsWithViews.com

November 3, 2008

status. First, Berg v Obama, et al. Phil's web site has had more than 86 MILLION hits since he filed. The day after Phil Berg

2008' and Writ of Certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court, a

news wire story flashed around the world, Oct. 31, 2008:

25, 2. CE

Health Screening for

Forced Mental Your Children How the IRS Lies to

Employers About

Withholding

injunction to Stay the Presidential Election of November 4,

filed an 'Application to Justice Souter for an Immediate

They Aren't Telling Vote Frand: What

Ņ

Articles: Devvy

It is firmly

(Obama's mother)

Mangunharjo, a







IAW * PASTEURIZED

certificate on record in accordance with state policies and Department of Health has Sen. Obama's original birth procedures. his lawsuit Merchandise Submit Story NWV Store Advertise Writers Books DVD

Obama II; his name was legally changed Obama spent years Indonesian schools husband adopted citizen. Her new to Barry Soctoro. in Indonesia and Barack Hussein attended two candidate was bornjin Honoluly....Citing her statutory authority to oversee and maintain Hawail's vital records, Pukino said she has "personally seen and verified that the Hawaii State Obama's Hawaii birth certificate confirmed. "The director of Hawaii's Department of Health confirmed on Friday what

Barack Obama bas been saying all along: the presidential

The very next day, Nov. 1, 2008, Andy Martin, J. D. and Professor of Law (AdJ.) had his own announcement regarding Chirona

11/6/2008 12:44 PM 2 of 8

ъ

Contact NWV



Devvy Kidd -- Stop the election: accurate vote count impossible, Part 1

accepted", as Obama's COLB, fake or not, does. The wording accepted" means that is the date the Department of Health in certificate, nor could she have gotten Obama out of Kenya." However, on the bottom left of a Certification of Live Birth, Dunham could not have registered Obama's birth in Hawaii again for births abroad, it states on the bottom left corner Hawaii accepted the registration and the documentation. without the original "vault" version of the foreign birth

Another effort is underway to get to the truth:

November 2, 2008: New Federal Lawsuit Against Obama

president that has no authority running your military nominating judges and other officials, and pretending to sign laws: all of those acts are automatically invalid. That is the only reason this matters. As McCain has been ruled by a judge to be constitutionally eligible for office "we must also know for a fact that all candidates are so eligible by verifiable documentation If we are to elect an unqualified candidate that assumes office, nothing that office holder does has any validity. Imagine a "Why does it matter that we see Obama's real birth certificate? for the offices they seek and those they hold...

*



Monday. There is need for all political parties to be represented in this suit. The outcome of this election is imminently upon us. preferably democrat, to volunteer their names on this suit by "We need persons who are members of the electoral college, If you don't rise to this occasion, who will?" Please note the asterisk above. Hundreds of emailers wanted to know why I haven't written about McCain's eligibility status? I have in the past and here is the court ruling that stopped all challenges:

Federal Court Holds Hearing on Lawsuit to Remove McCain from California Ballot

Robinson is also a candidate for presidential elector, pledged to "Robinson v Bowen is different, because it was filed by the state Robinson (although that party has an internal factional dispute and Robinson's office is not completely, permanently secure). Alan Keyes. The leading precedent on who has standing to chairman of the American Independent Party, Markham


















Panama Canal Zone, but for purposes of the lawsuit, it assumes "The Robinson lawsuit notes that there is some controversy as never part of the Canal Zone), or whether he was born in the to whether McCain was born in Colon, Panama (which was he was born in the Canal Zone...

presidential candidate who is not eligible to be president should Court minutes, Sep. 26, 1968, case no. 7838, not reported. Thus not be placed on the ballot. Cleaver v Jordan, Calif. Supreme if it were true that McCain were not eligible to be president, under the Eldridge Cleaver precedent, the California ballot extremely unlikely that any federal judge would rule that vice-president, for the Republican ticket. Of course, it is "In 1968, the California Supreme Court voted 6-1 that a should list a blank for president, and Sarah Palin for McCain is not eligible to be president."

Judge Rules McCain's U.S. Citizenship is "Highly Probable"

also ruled that the plaintiff has "no greater stake than a taxpayer placement on the California ballot should be dismissed......Alsup Republican presidential candidate John McCain's claim of U.S. occur only after the electoral and congressional processes have placement on the ballot. Interestingly, Alsup went on to 20th Amendments to the Constitution to challenge a say that procedures are available under the 12th and counted, not before. "Judicial review — if any — should candidate's qualifications when electoral votes are citizenship is strong enough that a lawsuit challenging his or voters" and so had no standing to challenge McCain's "A San Francisco federal judge ruled late Tuesday that run their course." (Emphasis mine)

'claims" he's a natural born citizen, so that's good enough for Highly probable' is an interesting way for a judge to rule on citizenship. Either you are or you aren't, but in that lawsuit, assumes he [McCain] was born in the Canal Zone." McCain the judge. Dr. Edwin Vieira, has this to say on the matter:

'1) The notion that judicial review--if any--should occur only

4 of 8

7

http://www.newswithviews.com/Devvy/kidd405

http://www.newswithviews.com/Devvy/kidd409.htm

ځ

ټ

evvy Kidd -- Stop the election: accurate vote count impossible, Part 1

Nov. 3, 100 F

Devvy Kidd -- Stop the election: accurate vote count impossible, Part 1

has purported to elect a President is a trap. Then the judges will House) to which the Constitution delegates exclusive authority. The matter must be determined BEFORE the votes. NO elector AFTER the Electoral College or the House of Representatives because it has been decided by the bodies (the College or the and NO Member of the House has any right to vote for an say it is "too late", that the matter is a "political question" ineligible candidate.

copy are, of necessity, contemporary materials. But a 40+ year document) is NOT enough. The ORIGINAL document must be forged at all. (E.g., are they using the same paper and ink they forgery be undetectable because all of the components of the old birth certificate will be much harder to forge, if it can be determined. A "certified copy" can be forged today, and the produced, so that its authenticity (especially its age) can be "(2) A "certified copy" of a birth certificate (or equivalent were using 40 years ago for such documents; or the same typefaces?)'

There is another area regarding citizenship that has been brought up as an issue:

December 24, 1952 to November 13, 1986

7

citizens and at least one had a prior residence in the United States, you automatically acquired U.S. citizenship with no "If, at the time of your birth, both your parents were U.S. conditions for retaining it.

November 14, 1986, your father must have established paternity you were born outside of marriage, the same rules apply if your ather legally legitimated you before your 21st birthday and you "If only one parent was a U.S. citizen at the time of your birth, that parent must have resided in the United States for at least prior to your 18th birthday, either by acknowledgment or by court order, and must have stated in writing that he would citizenship. If your one U.S. citizen parent is your father and were unmarried at the time. If legitimization occurred after ten years, at least five of which had to be after the age of 16. There are no conditions placed on retaining this type of support you financially until your 18th birthday."

citizen from Kenya, not a U.S. citizen. Some have given the opinion that under the British Nationality Act of 1948, Obama II would also be a citizen of Kenya. I am not familiar with this Act, Obama's father, Barack Hussein Obama, Sr, was a Muslim out did find it here.

Undeniable facts: Obama's mother was 18 years old when Obama was born. His father was a citizen of Kenya, a Muslim who Tater became an atheist like Obama's mother, Stanley. Kezia; they had four children. While still married to Kezia, Obama Sr., was married over in Kenya to a woman named

8

children to fend for themselves. While in Hawaii, he meets and Obama is born August 4, 1961, seven months later. In 1962, Obama Sr., splits from second wife, Obama's mother. Obama's marries Obama's mother, also an atheist, on February 2, 1961. Obama's father then goes to Hawaii, leaving her and the parents divorce in 1964.

schools. As this document clearly shows, Obama is identified as mother) married Lolo Soetoro Mangunharjo, a Muslim Indonesian citizen. Her new husband adopted Barack Hussein Obama II, his name was legally changed to Barry Soctoro. Obama spent years in Indonesia and attended two Indonesian it is firmly established that Stanley Ann Dunham (Obama's Indonesian citizen.

Dunham. Obama failed to disclose any of his other known names on his Illinois Bar Registration. He lied without blinking citizen. There appears to be no effort by Obama to reclaim U.S. citizenship. Many want to know what documentation Obama What I can find in my research is that under Indonesian law an adopted child "has the same status as a natural child, and that used to acquire a U.S. passport? I have no answer to that one and the U.S. State Department certainly will not release any adoption." This would mean Obama became an Indonesian Soetoro, aka Barry Obama, aka Barack Dunham, aka Barry information (mless ordered by a federal judge. Heck, who knows anything about Barack Hussein Obama, aka Barry his or her relationship to the birth parents is severed by

certificate they released in June. These are documents sent over Those following this constitutional issue have seen the denials by the Obama camp as well as analysis on the alleged birth to me by Phil's assistant, Lisa:

NewsWithViews Please Support Click here to donate.

1. Affidavit of Bishop Ron McRae;

pertaining to Obama until AFTER the sham called an election 2. Exhibits which go with the Affidavit of Bishop Ron McRae. Remember: The Kenyan government has sealed all records

3. Affidavit of Kweli Shuhubia


4. Transcription of the audio tape of the interview with Sarah Obama, Senator Obama's grandmother.

Sign Up For

dorryke Riallis. 4.

6 of 8





Additional Titles

OBAMA MUST STAND UP NOW OR STEP DOWN

By Dr. Edwin Vieira, Jr., Ph.D., J.D. October 29, 2008 NewsWithViews.com

Other Vieira Articles:

Are Monetary & Banking Crises Inevitable in the Near Future?

"Homeland Security" -- For What and For Whom?

NWV Store
Books
DVDs
Merchandise
Writers
Advertise
Submit Story
Contact NWV
Donate to NWV
About NWV
NWV Home

More Vieira Articles: America is facing potentially the gravest constitutional crisis in her history. Barack Obama must either stand up in a public forum and prove, with conclusive documentary evidence, that he is "a natural born Citizen" of the United States who has not renounced his American citizenship—or he must step down as the Democratic Party's candidate for President of the United States—preferably before the election is held, and in any event before the Electoral College meets. Because, pursuant to the Constitution, only "a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States at the time of the Adoption of th[e] Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President" (Article II, Section 1, Clause 4). And Obama clearly was not "a Citizen of the United States at the time of the Adoption of th[e] Constitution."

Whether the evidence will show that Obama is, or is not, "a natural born Citizen" who has never renounced his American citizenship is an open question. The arguments on both sides are as yet speculative. But Obama's stubborn refusal to provide what he claims is "his own" country with conclusive proof on that score compels the presumption that he knows, or at least strongly suspects, that no sufficient evidence in his favor exists. After all, he is not being pressed to solve a problem in quantum physics that is "above his pay grade," but only asked to provide the public with the original copy of some official record that establishes his citizenship. The vast majority of Americans could easily do so. Why will Obama not dispel the doubts about his eligibility—unless he can not?

Now that Obama's citizenship has been seriously questioned, the burden of proof rests squarely on his shoulders. The "burden of establishing a delegation of power to the United States * * * is upon those making the claim." Bute v. Illinois, 333 U.S. 640, 653 (1948). And if each of the General Government's powers must be proven (not simply presumed) to exist, then every requirement that the Constitution sets for any individual's exercise of those powers must also be proven (not simply presumed) to be fully satisfied before that individual may exercise any of those powers. The Constitution's command that "[n]o Person except a natural born Citizen * * * shall be eligible to the Office of President" is an absolute prohibition against the exercise of each and every Presidential

Whether the evidence will show that Obama is, or is not, "a natural born Citizen" who has never renounced his American citizenship is an open question.





power by certain unqualified individuals. Actually (not simply presumptively or speculatively) being "a natural born Citizen" is the condition precedent sine qua non for avoiding this prohibition. Therefore, anyone who claims eligibility for "the Office of President" must, when credibly challenged, establish his qualifications in this regard with sufficient evidence.

SECRETARY OF STATE

In disposing of the lawsuit Berg v. Obama, which squarely presents the question of Obama's true citizenship, the presiding judge complained that Berg "would have us derail the democratic process by invalidating a candidate for whom millions of people voted and who underwent excessive vetting during what was one of the most hotly contested presidential primary in living memory." This is exceptionally thin hogwash. A proper judicial inquiry into Obama's eligibility for "the Office of President" will not deny his supporters a "right" to vote for him-rather, it will determine whether they have any such "right" at all. For, just as Obama's "right" to stand for election to "the Office of President" is contingent upon his being "a natural born Citizen," so too are the "rights" of his partisans to vote for him contingent upon whether he is even eligible for that "Office." If Obama is ineligible, then no one can claim any "right" to vote for him. Indeed, in that case every American who does vote has a constitutional duty to vote against him.

The judge in Berg v. Obama dismissed the case, not because Obama has actually proven that he is eligible for "the Office of President," but instead because, simply as a voter, Berg supposedly lacks "standing" to challenge Obama's eligibility:

regardless of questions of causation, the grievance remains too generalized to establish the existence of an injury in fact. * ** [A] candidate's ineligibility under the Natural Born Citizen Clause does not result in an injury in fact to voters. By extension, the theoretical constitutional harm experienced by voters does not change as the candidacy of an allegedly ineligible candidate progresses from the primaries to the general election.

This pronouncement does not rise to the level of hogwash.

First, the Constitution mandates that "[t]he judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution" (Article III, Section 2, Clause 1). Berg's suit plainly "aris[es] under th[e] Constitution," in the sense of raising a critical constitutional issue. So the only question is whether his suit is a constitutional "Case[]." The present judicial test for whether a litigant's claim constitutes a constitutional "Case[]" comes under the rubric of "standing"—a litigant with "standing" may proceed; one without "standing" may not. "Standing," however, is not a term found anywhere in the Constitution. Neither are the specifics of the doctrine of "standing," as they have been elaborated in judicial decision after judicial decision, to be found there. Rather, the test for "standing" is almost entirely a judicial invention.

True enough, the test for "standing" is not as ridiculous as the judiciary's so-called "compelling governmental interest test," which licenses public officials to abridge individuals' constitutional rights and thereby exercise powers the Constitution withholds from those officials, which has no basis whatsoever in the Constitution, and which is actually anti-constitutional. Neither is the doctrine of "standing" as abusive as the "immunities" judges have cut from whole cloth for public officials who violate their constitutional "Oath[s] or Affirmation[s], to support this Constitution" (Article VI, Clause 3)-in the face of the Constitution's explicit limitation on official immunities (Article I, Section 6, Clause 1). For the Constitution does require that a litigant must present a true "Case[]." Yet, because the test for "standing" is largely a contrivance of all-too-fallible men and women, its specifics can be changed as easily as they were adopted, when they are found to be faulty. And they must be changed if the consequences of judicial ignorance, inertia, and inaction are not to endanger America's constitutional form of government. Which is precisely the situation here, inasmuch as the purported "election" of Obama as President, notwithstanding his ineligibility for that office, not only will render illegitimate the Executive Branch of the General Government, but also will render impotent its Legislative Branch (as explained below).

Second, the notion upon which the judge in Berg v. Obama fastened-namely, that Berg's "grievance remains too generalized to establish the existence of an injury in fact," i.e., if everyone is injured or potentially injured then no one has "standing"—is absurd on its face.

To be sure, no one has yet voted for Obama in the general election. But does that mean that no one in any group smaller than the general pool of America's voters in its entirety has suffered specific harm from Obama's participation in the electoral process to date? Or will suffer such harm from his continuing participation? What about the Democrats who voted for Hillary Clinton as their party's nominee, but were saddled with Obama because other Democrats voted for him even though they could not legally have done so if his lack of eligibility for "the Office of President" had been judicially determined before the Democratic primaries or convention? What about the States that have registered Obama as a legitimate candidate for President, but will have been deceived, perhaps even defrauded, if he is proven not to be "a natural born Citizen"? And as far as the general election is concerned, what about the voters among erstwhile Republicans and Independents who do not want John McCain as President, and therefore will vote for Obama (or any Democrat, for that matter) as "the lesser of two evils," but who later on may have their votes effectively thrown out, and may have to suffer McCain's being declared the winner of the election, if Obama's ineligibility is established? Or what about those voters who made monetary contributions to Obama's campaign, but may at length discover that their funds went, not only to an ineligible candidate, but to one who knew he was ineligible?



These obvious harms pale into insignificance, however, compared to the national disaster of having an outright usurper purportedly "elected" as "President." In this situation, it is downright idiocy to claim, as did the judge in Berg v. Obama, that a "generalized" injury somehow constitutes no judicially cognizable injury at all. Self-evidently, to claim that a "generalized" grievance negates "the existence of an injury in fact" is patently illogical—for if everyone in any group can complain of the same harm of which any one of them can complain, then the existence of some harm cannot be denied; and the more people who can complain of that harm, the greater the aggregate or cumulative seriousness of the injury. The whole may not be greater than the sum of its parts; but it is at least equal to that sum! Moreover, for a judge to rule that no injury redressable in a court of law exists, precisely because everyone in America will be subjected to an individual posing as "the President" but who constitutionally

cannot be (and therefore is not) the President, sets America on the course of judicially assisted political suicide. If Obama turns out to be nothing more than an usurper who has fraudulently seized control of the Presidency, not only will the Constitution have been egregiously flouted, but also this whole country could be, likely will be, destroyed as a consequence. And if this country is even credibly threatened with destruction, every American will be harmed—irretrievably, should the threat become actuality—including those who voted or intend to vote for Obama, who are also part of We the People. Therefore, in this situation, any and every American must have "standing" to demand—and must demand, both in judicial fora and in the fora of public opinion—that Obama immediately and conclusively prove himself eligible for "the Office of President."

Utterly imbecilic as an alternative is the judge's prescription in Berg v. Obama that,

[i]f, through the political process, Congress determines that citizens, voters, or party members should police the Constitution's eligibility requirements for the Presidency, then it is free to pass laws conferring standing on individuals like [Berg]. Until that time, voters do not have standing to bring the sort of challenge that [Berg] attempts to bring * * * .

Recall that this selfsame judge held that Berg has no constitutional "Case[]" because he has no "standing," and that he has no "standing" because he has no "injury in fact," only a "generalized" "grievance." This purports to be a finding of constitutional law: namely, that constitutionally no "Case[]" exists. How, then, can Congress constitutionally grant "standing" to individuals such as Berg, when the courts (assuming the Berg decision is upheld on appeal) have ruled that those individuals have no "standing"? If "standing" is a constitutional conception, and the courts deny that "standing" exists in a situation such as this, and the courts have the final say as to what the Constitution means—then Congress lacks any power to contradict them. Congress cannot instruct the courts to exercise jurisdiction beyond what the Constitution includes within "the judicial Power." Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 173-180 (1803).

In fact, though, a Congressional instruction is entirely unnecessary. Every American has what lawyers call "an implied cause of action"—directly under Article II, Section 1, Clause 4 of the Constitution—to require that anyone standing for "the Office of President" must verify his eligibility for that position, at least when serious allegations have been put forward that he is not eligible, and he has otherwise refused to refute those allegations with evidence that should be readily available if he is eligible. That "Case[]" is one the Constitution itself defines. And the Constitution must be enforceable in such a "Case[]" in a timely manner, by anyone who cares to seek enforcement, because of the horrendous consequences that will ensue if it is flouted.

What are some of those consequences?

First, if Obama is not "a natural born Citizen" or has renounced such citizenship, he is simply not eligible for "the Office of President" (Article II, Section 1, Clause 4). That being so, he cannot be "elected" by the voters, by the Electoral College, or by the House of Representatives (see Amendment XII). For neither the voters, nor the Electors, nor Members of the House can change the constitutional requirement, even by unanimous vote inter sese (see Article V). If, nonetheless, the voters, the


Electors, or the Members of the House purport to "elect" Obama, he will be nothing but an *usurper*, because the Constitution defines him as such. And he can never become anything else, because an usurper cannot gain legitimacy if even all of the country aid, abets, accedes to, or acquiesces in his usurpation.

Second, if Obama dares to take the Presidential "Oath or Affirmation" of office, knowing that he is not "a natural born Citizen," he will commit the crime of perjury or false swearing (see Article II, Section 1, Clause 7). For, being ineligible for "the Office of President, he cannot "faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States," or even execute it at all, to any degree. Thus, his very act of taking the "Oath or Affirmation" will be a violation thereof! So, even if the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court himself looks the other way and administers the "Oath or Affirmation," Obama will derive no authority whatsoever from it.

Third, his purported "Oath or Affirmation" being perjured from the beginning, Obama's every subsequent act in the usurped "Office of President" will be a criminal offense under Title 18, United States Code, Section 242, which provides that:

> [w]hoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States * * * shall be fined * * * or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined * * * or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, * * *, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined * * * or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

Plainly enough, every supposedly "official" act performed by an usurper in the President's chair will be an act "under color of law" that necessarily and unavoidably "subjects [some] person *** to the deprivation of [some] rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution *** of the United States"—in the most general case, of the constitutional "right[]" to an eligible and duly elected individual serving as President, and the corresponding constitutional "immunit[y]" from subjection to an usurper pretending to be "the President."



Fourth, if he turns out to be nothing but an usurper acting in the guise of "the President," Obama will not constitutionally be the "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into the actual Service of the United States" (see Article II, Section 2, Clause 1). Therefore, he will be entitled to no obedience whatsoever from anyone in those forces. Indeed, for officers or men to follow any of his purported "orders" will constitute a serious breach of military discipline—and in extreme circumstances perhaps even "war crimes." In addition, no one in any civilian agency in the Executive Branch of the General Government will be required to put into effect any of Obama's

purported "proclamations," "executive orders," or "directives."

SECRETARY OF STATE

Fifth, as nothing but an usurper (if he becomes one), Obama will have no conceivable authority "to make Treaties", or to "nominate, and * * * appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not * * * otherwise provided for [in the Constitution]" (Article II, Section 2, Clause 2). And therefore any "Treaties" or "nominat[ions], and * * * appoint[ments]" he purports to "make" will be void ab initio, no matter what the Senate does, because the Senate can neither authorize an usurper to take such actions in the first place, nor thereafter ratify them. One need not be a lawyer to foresee what further, perhaps irremediable, chaos must ensue if an usurper, even with "the Advice and Consent of the Senate", unconstitutionally "appoint[s] * * * Judges of the Supreme Court" whose votes thereafter make up the majorities that wrongly decide critical "Cases" of constitutional law.

Sixth, and perhaps most importantly, Congress can pass no law while an usurper pretends to occupy "the Office of President." The Constitution provides that "[e]very Bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a Law, be presented to the President of the United States" (Article I, Section 7, Clause 2). Not to an usurper posturing as "the President of the United States," but to the true and rightful President. If no such true and rightful President occupies the White House, no "Bill" will or can, "before it become a Law, be presented to [him]." If no "Bill" is so presented, no "Bill" will or can become a "Law." And any purported "Law" that the usurper "approve[s]" and "sign[s]," or that Congress passes over the usurper's "Objections," will be a nullity. Thus, if Obama deceitfully "enters office" as an usurper, Congress will be rendered effectively impotent for as long as it acquiesces in his pretenses as "President."

Seventh, if Obama does become an usurper posturing as "the President," Congress cannot even impeach him because, not being the actual President, he cannot be "removed from Office on Impeachment for, and Conviction of, Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors" (see Article II, Section 4). In that case, some other public officials would have to arrest him—with physical force, if he would not go along quietly—in order to prevent him from continuing his imposture. Obviously, this could possibly lead to armed conflicts within the General Government itself, or among the States and the people.

Eighth, even did something approaching civil war not eventuate from Obama's hypothetical usurpation, if the Establishment allowed Obama to pretend to be "the President," and the people acquiesced in that charade, just about everything that was done during his *faux* "tenure in office" by anyone connected with the Executive Branch of the General Government, and quite a bit done by the Legislative Branch and perhaps the Judicial Branch as well, would be arguably illegitimate and subject to being overturned when a constitutional President was finally installed in office. The potential for chaos, both domestically and internationally, arising out of this systemic uncertainty is breathtaking.

The underlying problem will not be obviated if Obama, his partisans in the Democratic Party, and his cheerleaders and cover-up artists in the big media simply stonewall the issue of his (non)citizenship and contrive for him to win the Presidential election. The cat is already out of the bag and running all over the Internet. If he continues to dodge the issue, Obama will be dogged with this question every day of his

purported "Presidency." And inevitably the truth will out. For the issue is too simple, the evidence (or lack of it) too accessible. Either Obama can prove that he is "a natural born Citizen" who has not renounced his citizenship; or he cannot. And he will not be allowed to slip through with some doctored "birth certificate" generated long after the alleged fact. On a matter this important, Americans will demand that, before its authenticity is accepted, any supposed documentary evidence of that sort be subjected to reproducible forensic analyses conducted by reputable, independent investigators and laboratories above any suspicion of being influenced by or colluding with any public official, bureaucracy, political party, or other special-interest organization whatsoever.



Berg v. Obama may very well end up in the Supreme Court. Yet that ought to be unnecessary. For Obama's moral duty is to produce the evidence of his citizenship sua sponte et instanter. Otherwise, he will be personally responsible for all the consequences of his refusal to do so.

Sign Up For Free NWV Alerts

Of course, if Obama knows that he is not "a natural born Citizen" who never renounced his American citizenship, then he also knows that he and his henchmen have perpetrated numerous election-related frauds throughout the country—the latest, still-ongoing one a colossal swindle targeting the American people as a whole. If that is the case, his refusal "to be a witness against himself" is perfectly explicable and even defensible on the grounds of the Fifth Amendment. Howsoever justified as a matter of criminal law, though, Obama's silence and inaction will not obviate the necessity for him to prove his eligibility for "the Office of President." The Constitution may permit him to "take the Fifth;" but it will not suffer him to employ that evasion as a means to usurp the Presidency of the United States.

© 2008 Edwin Vieira, Jr. - All Rights Reserve

Printer Friendly

E-mail This Page

Sign Up For Free E-Mail Alerts
E-Mails are used strictly for NWVs alerts, not for sale

Edwin Vieira, Jr., holds four degrees from Harvard: A.B. (Harvard College), A.M. and Ph.D. (Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences), and J.D. (Harvard Law School).

For more than thirty years he has practiced law, with emphasis on constitutional issues. In the Supreme Court of the United States he successfully argued or briefed the cases leading to the landmark decisions Abood v. Detroit Board of Education, Chicago Teachers Union v. Hudson, and Communications Workers of America v. Beck, which established constitutional and statutory limitations on the uses to which labor unions, in both the private and the public

sectors, may apply fees extracted from nonunion workers as a condition of their employment.

He has written numerous monographs and articles in scholarly journals, and lectured throughout the county. His most recent work on money and banking is the two-volume Pieces of Eight: The Monetary Powers and Disabilities of the United States Constitution (2002), the most comprehensive study in existence of American monetary law and history viewed from a constitutional perspective.

www.piecesofeight.us

He is also the co-author (under a nom de plume) of the political novel <u>CRA\$HMAKER</u>: A Federal Affaire (2000), a not-so-fictional story of an engineered crash of the Federal Reserve System, and the political upheaval it causes. <u>www.crashmaker.com</u>

His latest book is: "<u>How To Dethrone the Imperial Judiciary</u>" ... and <u>Constitutional "Homeland Security</u>," Volume One, The Nation in Arms...

He can be reached at: 13877 Napa Drive Manassas, Virginia 20112.

E-Mail: Not available

Home

Discount Gold and addressed and a std. net

Setails here

Simply...

the best

Dist Augh: Oben to Be.

Constitutiona

11/6/2008 12:25 PM

http://www.newswithviews.com/Devvy/kidd411.htm

Nevvy Kidd -- Comrade Barack Obama is not America's next president

Donate to NWV

200

(attentions) to Your Creditors

W. W. Deopie

You Are a Stave

About NWV NWV Home

¿NIS

Contrary to the propaganda spewed last night by the pinps who work for corporate meet president. We need to remember how the system actually works:

Congressional Research Service "The Library of Congress Analyst in American National Government Government and Finance Division CRS Report for Congress The Electoral College: November 5, 2004 Thomas H. Neale

> Articles Devy. More

"When Americans vote for a President and Vice President, they actually vote for presidential electors, known collectively as the electoral college. It is these electors, chosen by the people, who elect the chief executive....

"Electors assemble in their respective states on Monday after the second Wednesday in December (December 13, 2004). They election held on Tuesday after the first Monday in November.... vice presidential nominees, for whom the people vote in the


Dr. 11 .N

are counted and declared at a joint session of Congress, held on ceases to exist for another four years. The electoral vote results President and Vice President, after which the electoral college January 6 of the year succeeding the election. A majority of are pledged and expected, but not required, to vote for the candidates they represent. Separate ballots are east for electoral votes (currently 270 of 538) is required to win. Until those electors meet on December 15, 2008, cast their vote and those votes are counted on January 6, 2008, Obama is not the next president.

Phil Berg's lawsuit is still active with the U.S. Supreme Court.

Andy Martin's lawsuit: The next hearing date is November 18,

I fully realize that Americans who haven't joined the Obama cult are stunged at what happened on Tuesday, but we must remember it was all in the game plan. I have used this metaplior before to describe the illusion of fair and impartial elections: It's all important when evil forces take over a country. That's what pm CST before half the states west of the Mississippi had even makes the student "feel" he has control and that perception is we saw yesterday. The fact that Meain conceded around 8:30 counted 20% of their votes, only confirms what millions of us actually controlling the vehicle. But, the fake steering wheel like a student taking driving lessons. The first time out, the student gets the fake steering wheel while the instructor is already knew - he was the designated loser.



COMRADE BARAK OBAMA

Additional Titles

IS NOT AMERICA'S NEXT

PRESIDENT



COLB - Certification prove he is a natural

of Live Birth - to

born citizen. Not a but the COLB. The

"birth certificate." fact that this thug

corrupted electronic voting machines and scanners, we have NO

What a scam. As I have covered in previous columns, between

dirty voting rolls, voter registration fraud, illegals voting and put on yesterday by the media; that will be my next column.

I'm not going to comment on the carefully orchestrated show

idea who was legally elected yesterday. I updated the compilation of vote fraud links, see liere. There are more at the

unresolved issue of Obama providing a

There is still the

brave, and hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot." Mark

"In the beginning of a change the patriot is a scarce man, and

© 2008 - NewsWithViews.com

November 6, 2008



from Chicago refuse



June, 2008, says it

document since to provide this

There is still the unresolved issue of Obama providing a COLB -

DVDs Merchandise Jontact NWV Submit Story Writers Advertise Books

office in the land

/Y TOTAL P.14

of 7

Articles: Devv

Iwain, Notebook, 1904

They Aren't Telling Vote Fraud: What

Health Screening for Forced Mental

How the IRS Lies to **Employers About** Your Children Withholding

bottom.

Certification of Live Birth - to prove he is a natural born citizen. Not a "birth certificate," but the COLB. The fact that this thug NWV Store

virtue of his mother's marriage to her Indonesian husband and 2008, says it all. The second issue is if Obama were born in the presidency. Naturalized citizens are not eligible for the highest from Chicago refuses to provide this document since June, U.S., but was automatically made an Indonesian citizen by Obama's legal name change, he is ineligible to run for the