



Today's Date:
June 17th, 2011

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Barack Obama, aka: Barack Obama, Jr., aka: Barack Hussein Obama, aka: Barry Soetoro; aka: Barry Obama; aka: Barack Obama, presumed President of the United States; Nancy Pelosi, Chair of the DNC; Democratic National Convention, et al.

Defendants

Eligibility Fraud and Treason Trial of Barack Obama

Today is historic. Barack Obama is on trial for what many are saying is the "Trial of the Century." Barack Hussein Obama, aka: Barry Soetoro has been accused of defrauding the electorate and usurping the Presidency of the United States.

We begin by reading the charge before the Jury:

Barack Obama is charged with committing Fraud and Treason against the People of the United States by causing his name to be placed on the Presidential election ballot when in fact he was ineligible to serve under Article 2, Section 1 of the Constitution:

"No person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States."

Barack Obama must defend against the charge by proving he is a "natural born" citizen before this Court.

For the Defense, we have the honorable **Johnny Crock**. Johnny Crock is a "multi-millionaire" and Founding Partner of the firm, Crock, Duck and Blame. Crock's firm specializes in the defense of high-profile criminals. Crock must have cost Obama an arm and a leg but we believe George Soros intervened and helped Obama out with a loan. We understand that Eric Holder's Department of Justice is refusing to help defend Obama so as to avoid being indicted himself as a co-conspirator in the crime. We are waiting word as to whether Nancy Pelosi will be charged as an additional-named Defendant in the trial. No word on that yet, we will let you know. If Obama gets convicted we will see many more heads roll.

For the Prosecution, we have the honorable **Terrence Founder**. "Founder Constitution" as his peers affectionately named him is a renowned Federal Prosecutor that carries a copy of the United States Constitution with him to every trial. He often quotes from it. Founder has an astonishing record of over 200 wins against corrupt government officials and leading Mafia figures in his career. Business has been slow the past couple of years for Founder as the Marxist government in power has limited indictments against "so-called" government corruption. Without the recent election of a newly "conservative" House and Senate we would not be here today.

The Presiding Judge is our old friend and nemesis **Judge Royce Lamberth**. Judge Lamberth presides over the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. When asked if he would be willing to hear such a high-profile case, he replied, "gladly."

Founder's opening statement to the Jury:

Your honor and distinguished jury members, thank you for allowing the citizens of our Country to stand before you and adjudicate such an infamous crime. It has long been the belief of many that fraud and treason were committed against the people and our sacred Constitution when the Democratic National Convention acknowledged the nomination of Barack

Your Honor and respected jury members, I come before you today to argue that such a great man as Barack Obama should have never been indicted nor his glorious name tarnished with such a proceeding as this trial. After all, Mr. Obama was elected by 53% of the popular vote in our Country. Mr. Obama's intentions were honorable and without guilt when he agreed to accept the Democratic National Committee's nomination as candidate for President of the United States. Any vetting by such a distinguished organization was their responsibility, not his. As such, we intend to prove at this trial that Barack Obama is not guilty of fraud or treason by reason of passing the buck.

Thank you.

Honorable Judge Lamberth: Mr. Founder, please call your first witness:

Founder: The prosecution calls John Jay.

Mr. Jay [as he places his left hand on the Bible and raises his right hand], "do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?"

Jay: I do.

Founder: Mr. Jay, please state your full name and occupation.

Jay: John Jay. Attorney, Statesman, Co-Author of the Federalist Papers, President of the Continental Congress, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Governor of New York.

Founder: Please tell us about Article 2, Section 1 of the Constitution. Please be specific as it applies to the "natural born" wording.

Jay: As I remember correctly, Alexander Hamilton wrote the first draft of the qualification requirements in Article 2. He suggestion that the wording be as follows:

"No person shall be eligible to the office of President of the United States unless he be now a Citizen of one of the States, or hereafter be born a Citizen of the United States."

I wrote General Washington, the Presiding President of the Constitutional Convention and asked him to reconsider the Hamilton proposal. I pointed out that foreign intervention on the newly Office of the Presidency could be a serious problem and the qualifications' requirement should be strengthened. I explained to him that the "natural born" alternative as espoused by Emer Vattel's 'Law of Nations' was the better choice.

An excerpt from my letter to Washington was as follows:

"Permit me to hint, whether it would be wise and seasonable to provide a strong check to the admission of Foreigners into the administration of our national Government; and to declare expressly that the Commander in Chief of the American army shall not be given to nor devolve on, any but a natural born Citizen."

Founder: Please tell the court who Vattel was and quote his "natural born" law if possible.

Jay: Sure, I know it well.

Emer (Emerich or Emmerich) de Vattel (April 25, 1714 - December 28, 1767) was a Swiss philosopher, diplomat, and legal expert whose theories laid the foundation of modern international law and political philosophy.

To my knowledge most all the Founding Fathers knew of Vattel, his work and fine reputation.

EXCERPT: de Vattel's Law of Nations circa 1758 Book 1, Chapter XIX, Sec. 212: The natives, or NATURAL-BORN CITIZENS, are those born in the country, of parents who are citizens.. The country of the fathers is therefore that of the children; and these become true citizens merely by their tacit consent.

Founder: Can you please tell us what happened at the Constitutional Convention with regard to Article 2, Section 1.

Jay: General Washington agreed with me and the qualifications were changed from "born a" Citizen to "natural born"

Jay: No, not at all. What you are referring to is the “Grandfather” clause.

Crock: What do you mean Grandfather clause?

Jay: We understood at the time that many distinguished citizens who would be qualified to assume the Office of the Presidency may not be citizens born on American soil, but rather those born of British or other descent. We intended to grandfather these citizens as to their right to run for Office of the Presidency. Once their generation of citizens died out our intention was to allow only “natural born” Citizens the right to assume the Office. As such we included the following wording in the Article:

“or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution.”

Crock: Uh, so to simply allow a “born Citizen” of the United States to hold the Office of the Presidency was never considered by the Constitutional Convention?

Jay: You are reaching for words Mr. Crock. As I explained earlier, Alexander Hamilton’s proposal was rejected. But to be specific to your question, the “natural born” Citizenship requirement was our intent for future generations, not “born a” Citizen.

Crock: No further questions of this person.

Judge Lamberth: Mr. Founder, redirect?

Founder: No, your Honor.. thank you!

Judge Lamberth: Please call your next witness.

Founder: We call Mario Apuzzo.

[Apuzzo was duly sworn in]

Founder: Mr. Apuzzo. Please state your full name and occupation

Apuzzo: Mario Apuzzo, Attorney, Constitutional Scholar.

Founder: We heard from Mr. John Jay as to the Founders’ reasoning for including the “natural born” clause in the Constitution. As a person that now resides in the “future generation” of American society can you please give us your interpretation of the history behind the “natural born” Article.

Apuzzo: Certainly. I supposed many of us in our profession who have challenged Barack Obama’s eligibility have studied and questioned Vattel and the Federalist Papers more than a few times. The Founding Fathers lived in a time when Vattel was the leading authority on International and Maritime law. As you may understand, England was the dominating Country at the time. England wished to control or colonize as many countries as possible. Their customs and laws helped build the English dynasty. If a person were born to an English father anywhere in the world, the English considered that person of English citizenship; if born to a foreign father but in a country under English control or colonization that person was still considered an English subject. The United States declared it’s Independence from England and as a result of winning the Revolutionary war crafted the United States Constitution. Some of the laws written and accepted by the Constitutional Convention were in fact old British common law, Scriptural Law (according to God) or established International or Maritime law. Our Constitution was unique but many of the concepts within the document extended all the way back to the Magna Carta and as stated before, the Bible.

Most every person that contributed to the Founding document understood Emer Vattel’s “Law of Nations.” There was no question in their minds as to what “natural born” Citizenship entailed. As such, the Founding Fathers adopted “natural born” as the specific wording in Article 2, Section 1 of the Constitution. As stated by John Jay, the Founding Fathers rejected Alexander Hamilton’s proposal to allow only “born a” Citizen to qualify, so the intent of the Constitution was precise, only a “natural born” Citizen would be acceptable.

Founder: Let me play the Devil’s advocate here. Why didn’t the Constitutional Convention simply include Vattel’s expanded definition of “natural born” in the Article 2, Section 1 clause?

Apuzzo: Simple. There was no need. All involved at the time understood the meaning of “natural born.” If I were to ask you what “driving under the influence” means today you would immediately explain your understanding of the term

Founder: I didn't know that. Please quote the clause.

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Sec. 8:

The Congress shall have Power.. To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations..

"Law of Nations" is capitalized, meaning our framers were citing a PROPER NAME. There was only one Law of Nations in 1787 officially declared. And yes, Congress and the Judiciary have the power to enforce ANY LAW mentioned in the Law of Nations written by Emer de Vattel.

Founder: Mr. Apuzzo, in your expert opinion, is Barack Obama a "natural born" Citizen as expressed and implied in the Constitution.

Apuzzo: No, he is not.

Founder: Could you be specific why he is not.

Apuzzo: Certainly. It is very simple. Barack Obama has openly admitted his father was not a U.S. Citizen at the time of his birth. That is all you need to know. He does not qualify as "natural born" because BOTH parents were not U.S. Citizens when the mother gave birth.

Founder: Okay, thank you. One last question Mr. Apuzzo. Does place of birth have anything to do with being "natural born?"

Apuzzo: In Obama's case, no. It doesn't matter where he was born. The two-parent rule of U.S. Citizenship is not met. Just for fun, if we were talking about a person whose parents were both U.S. Citizens but the child was born in a foreign country and the birth was not within a boundary considered U.S. sovereign soil (such as a military base, embassy, consulate, etc) then that child would still not meet the "natural born" requirement.

Founder: Can you give us an example of a person being born on foreign soil having two U.S. Citizen parents but still claiming "natural born" Citizenship.

Apuzzo: Yes, John McCain. He was not born on the military base in Panama. He was born in a local hospital in Panama City. John McCain is not a "natural born" Citizen.

Founder: Why is being born on 'native soil' so important.

Apuzzo: It goes to allegiance or claim of citizenship by the foreign power. Although highly unlikely, Panama could claim a birthright to John McCain. Look at it this way. Say, McCain had a criminal problem and he fled to Panama. McCain could possibly claim Panamanian citizenship thereby avoiding extradition. The Founders included the "natural born" clause for a specific reason. They wanted complete and sole allegiance of the President to the people of the United States. They especially didn't want any foreign power claiming a birthright that could impale a President's decision making when it came to looking out for the best interests of the Country.

Founder: Your Honor, I am finished with Mr. Apuzzo. Thank you.

Judge Lamberth: We will break for lunch at this time and be back in Court at 1:00 pm. I caution the jury to not discuss the proceedings thus far.

Judge Lamberth: Mr. Crock, you may cross-examine the witness.

Crock: Good Afternoon Mr. Apuzzo. I am amazed at your intense interest in such an obscure clause in the Constitution. I mean really Mr. Apuzzo, is this not the United States of America? Aren't all citizens to be treated equally under the protection of such laws? Mr. Obama was born in Hawaii and is a Citizen of the United States. Why do you folks not see the obvious here? Sorry Mr. Apuzzo, I will ask a question so you can respond.

Do you agree that Mr. Obama is a Citizen of the United States?

Apuzzo: I have no way of knowing.

Crock: How so?

Apuzzo: What you have is not a Certified Birth Certificate. There is nothing on that document that legally proves United States Citizenship, place of birth or for that matter whom the parents really were. That document merely states that a registration of birth was applied for. A Hospital or a State Official to my knowledge never certified the birth of Barack Obama in Hawaii.

Crock: Mr. Apuzzo, spare me the theatrics. Mr. Obama was born in Hawaii. It says so right here on this document. That makes him a United States Citizen.

Apuzzo: Most Birth Certificates I am familiar with all include the signatures of an Attending Physician and a State Official. Please show me on your document where such signatures appear?

Apuzzo: Look, Mr. Crock. We are wasting time here. I will accept your premise that Barack Obama may be a United States Citizen if that will set your mind at ease.

Crock: Okay fine. Duly noted. Mr. Apuzzo, my client, Mr. Obama is a well-respected individual and this country elected him with a majority of the vote. Do you believe the Constitution should bend according to the wishes of the majority?

Apuzzo: Absolutely not!

Crock: What do you mean “absolutely not!” Our country is only as strong as the laws that we abide by, such laws according to the will of the people. Would you not agree that just maybe the Constitution is somewhat archaic when it refuses to acknowledge the will of the people?

Apuzzo: Absolutely not!

Crock: Okay, I can see you are not getting the picture here. Let me put it this way. Since you agree Mr. Obama is a U.S. Citizen and he has sworn under oath to “defend and protect the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic” is that not good enough for you?

Apuzzo: Absolutely not! And before you give me another “you don’t understand” question let me say this: Mr. Obama can swear on a stack of Bibles or Korans for all I care. It makes no difference. My research and sources show Mr. Obama to be a British subject, a “dual citizen” at the very least and possibly even an “illegal alien.” Until you can get past those accusations you will continue to get an “Absolutely not” from me.

{{ the Court erupts into laughter }}

Crock: Your Honor, I have no more use for this witness.

Judge Lamberth: Mr. Founder, redirect to your witness?

Founder: Yes, please your Honor. Mr. Apuzzo, you just stated Mr. Obama is possibly an “illegal alien?” That’s a very damning statement. Can you please explain?

Apuzzo: I would be happy to. I prepared a brief on this when we filed our lawsuit against Obama.

Here is a summary of that brief:

Obama was a British citizen “at birth.”

* Under the British Nationality Act 1948[BNA 1948], Obama’s father was a British citizen/subject when he was born in the English colony of Kenya.

* Obama’s father continued to be such and not a U.S. citizen when Obama was born in 1961.

* Under the same BNA 1948, at birth, regardless of where he was born, Obama also became a British citizen/subject by descent from his British father.

* If Obama can claim U.S. citizenship he is also able to claim British citizenship at the same time. Under this scenario, Obama would be a “dual citizen.”

* It is public knowledge that Obama has admitted in his writings and otherwise that when he was born, his father was a British citizen/subject and not a United States citizen. In fact, his father was not even a permanent resident of the United States, but rather only a student who would probably have been here only on a temporary student visa. Hence, not only was Obama’s father not a United States citizen but Obama

* U.S. Immigration law at time of Obama's birth: A child born in wedlock and abroad to one U.S. citizen parent and one alien parent acquires U.S. citizenship at birth under Section 301(g) INA, provided the citizen parent was physically present in the U.S. for the time period required by the law applicable at the time of the child's birth. (For birth on or after November 14, 1986, a period of five years physical presence, two after the age of fourteen is required. For birth between December 24, 1952 and November 13, 1986, a period of ten years, five after the age of fourteen are required for physical presence in the U.S. to transmit U.S. citizenship to the child).

* Obama's mother, born on November 29, 1942, was 18 years old when she gave birth to Obama on August 4, 1961. She was 117 days short from being 19 years old. But she had to be at least 19 years old (14 years old plus 5 years of U.S. physical presence) to satisfy the legal requirement of Section 301(g). Hence, if Obama was born in Kenya, under the Fourteenth Amendment, he is neither a U.S. citizen by birth on U.S. soil nor one by naturalization. (There is no existing evidence that Obama was ever naturalized.) Nor would he qualify to be a U.S. citizen by any act of Congress by being born abroad to a U.S. citizen parent.

* If this scenario were proven to be true, it can be reasonably argued that Obama is an illegal alien.

* There are many who claim Obama was NOT born in the United States. Until Obama proves otherwise, which means he must produce a certified document from a hospital or a State that clearly certifies his claim of being born in Hawaii we can all assume he is an "illegal alien."

Founder: Thank you Mr. Apuzzo. No further questions.

Judge Lamberth: Please call your next witness.

Founder: We call Bob Campbell from American Grand Jury.

[Mr. Campbell is duly sworn in]

Founder: Good afternoon Mr. Campbell. Please state your full name and occupation.

Campbell: Robert Campbell. Founder of American Grand Jury. I am retired.

Founder: I will get right to the point. I am aware that your organization has extensively researched the "Eligibility" issue and you are familiar with all the documents researched by Mr. Apuzzo and the "Certification of Live Birth" shown to the Court today by Mr. Crock. Is that correct?

Campbell: Yes, that is correct.

Founder: We understand that in addition to the "Eligibility" charge you are aware of a "Conspiracy of Fraud" charge against the Democratic National Convention, Nancy Pelosi, Barack Obama and others. Is that correct?

Campbell: Yes, that is correct.

Founder: Can you please tell the Court the details behind the Conspiracy?

Campbell: Sure. It is common knowledge that all candidates for national election must be nominated by their respective parties to be placed on the ballot in all 50 States. Most all States to my knowledge require a person like the Secretary of State to accept the nomination in writing before placing a name on the ballot. Unfortunately, most States leave the vetting process up to the Political Party to determine the qualification of such candidate.

Founder: Please stop right there. What do you mean by vetting?

Campbell: Vetting is a political term I guess you would call it. It means in laymen's terms to "qualify or approve." In election terms a candidate has to qualify as to age, citizenship, place of residence.. that sort of thing to be placed on the ballot. Some States have different requirements but in general they are mostly the same. For example, a person could not run for County Commissioner if he didn't reside in the County for which he was placed on the ballot. This is fairly straightforward.

For a Presidential election the vetting is a little more complicated because the Article 2, Section 1 Constitutional clause applies. Both the Democratic and Republican National Conventions go so far as to expressly acknowledge in writing that their candidate is qualified to serve and be placed on the ballot.

Notice the last line in the paragraph.. “legally qualified to serve under the provisions of the United States Constitution..”

The Republican National Convention has similar wording and they did indeed Certify John McCain and Sara Palin to be qualified using the following wording: “meeting the Constitutional requirements for the Office of the President of the United States..”

Again, the word “Constitution or Constitutional” appears in both documents. The intent is very clear. Both National Conventions swear by affidavit that their candidates meet the requirements of the Constitution to be elected to Office.

Founder: So Mr. Campbell, I see nothing wrong with such wording. Where is the conspiracy?

Campbell: It is painfully simple. Right out in front for God and Country to see. The Democratic National Convention CHANGED the wording. Nancy Pelosi as Chairman of the Democratic National Convention signed a document that specifically removed the “Constitutional clause” from the Affidavit.

The revised “Official Certification of Nomination” signed by Nancy Pelosi read as follows:

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that at the National Convention of the Democrat Party of the United States of America, held in Denver, Colorado on August 25 though 28, 2008, the following were duly nominated as candidates of said Party for President and Vice President of the United States respectively..

Nobody picked up on it. Not a single State cried foul. Not a single election official challenged the Democratic National Convention’s vetting of Barack Obama.

As a result, Barack Obama’s name was placed on the ballot and a person that did not meet the requirements of the Constitution was elected. The rest is history.

The Conspiracy is this. There is no way on God’s green earth that Nancy Pelosi, Howard Dean, Barack Obama and others would change the Affidavit unless they wished to hide the truth. Why would they? These people simply believed that they could do no wrong and that their simple Affidavit hiding the truth wouldn’t make a difference to anyone. These people in fact, subverted and defrauded the Constitution and every person that voted in the election.

This is a very serious crime.

Founder: Wait a minute. I know a little bit about the law. What if Nancy Pelosi signed a document and she was unaware that the “Constitutional clause” had been omitted? That would be a legitimate defense.

Campbell: No, Mr. Founder. That is not possible. Nancy Pelosi signed two unique “Official Certification of Nomination” documents. Both documents were signed on the same day and acknowledged by the same Notary Public. One document contained the Constitutional wording and the other did not. The document that was sent to 49 of the 50 States did not have the Constitutional wording. The document that went to Hawaii included the Constitution wording, for what reasons we don’t know. I can only speculate as to why Hawaii received the other document.

Founder: So in effect, Nancy Pelosi and the Democratic National Convention would have had to of known through the vetting of Barack Obama that he was not Constitutionally eligible or they would not have attempted to hide the truth by removing the wording on the Affidavit. Is that correct?

Campbell: Yes, I believe any sane person can figure that one out. Nancy Pelosi in collusion with others conspired to defraud the voters in this Country.

Founder: Thank you Mr. Campbell. No further questions.

Judge Lamberth: Mr. Crock, your cross of this witness?

Crock: No, your honor. Nancy Pelosi is not here to answer the allegations so we do not wish to muddy the water. I think Mr. Campbell may be shooting at stars. A simple word change in an Affidavit doesn’t mean much in our opinion.

Judge Lamberth: Mr. Founder. Please call you next witness?

Founder: The prosecution has no more witnesses at this time.

Judoe Lamberth: Mr Crock are you prepared for the Defense?

hand on the Bible. He wants a Koran]

Judge Lamberth: Mr. Obama can raise his right hand and swear in without a Bible. The Koran is out of the question.

[Obama is sworn in without a Bible]

Crock: President Obama, please state your full name and occupation.

Obama: Barry.. err, Barack Hussein Obama. President of the United States.

Crock: President Obama, please tell us in your own words where you were born, who your parents were and what is your nationality and citizenship.

Obama: I was born at Queen's Med.. err, I mean Kapi'olani Medical Center on August 4th, 1961 in Honolulu, Hawaii. My mother's name was Ann Dunham. I am an American, a "native born" Citizen.

Crock: Thank you. Please tell us when you first decided to run for President.

Obama: Well, I have always known I would someday run for President. I remember back at Occidental College in California telling my roommate that I hoped to meet the right people someday so I could run for national office.

Crock: Tell us about being nominated at the Democratic National Convention. What did you realize at that point?

Obama: I realized I just beat the pants off of the Clinton machine. I knew I could do it. My personality is such that people can really identify with me. I figured it was about time that the DNC had a candidate of my qualifications to lead the Party.

Crock: You are being charged with Eligibility Fraud and Treason at this trial. What is your take on that?

Obama: The "birthers" have been trying to get me for years now. The charges are nothing more than a political witch-hunt to get me to step-down or not run in 2012. It will never happen. I have total confidence that the jury will acquit me.

Crock: During discovery you were asked to submit to the Court your "long-form" Birth Certificate? Was that document submitted?

Obama: Well, actually we submitted the Birth Certificate as asked for. I am not sure whether you would call it a "long-form" or not. You have the document on your desk there. You showed it to the Court already. I can assure you the document is real.

Crock: Did Nancy Pelosi specifically ask you to show your proof of U.S. Citizenship.

Obama: Well yes. The DNC was given the Birth Certificate you have and in addition they were able to see my Passport that clearly identified me as a U.S. Citizen.

Crock: So in your mind, you met all the requirements of the Democratic National Convention to run for Office of the Presidency.

Obama: Absolutely!

Crock: Thank you President Obama. No further questions.

Judge Lamberth: Mr. Founder, you may cross-examine the witness.

Founder: Thank you, your Honor. Good-afternoon Mr. Obama.

Obama: Please address me as President Obama or Mr. President.

Founder: I think we can drop the formal titles here. You can call me Mr. Founder or Terrence. I will call you Mr. Obama. Let's move on.

Obama: I object. I am the President. I am entitled to such honor from those addressing me.

Founder: Your Honor, can you please settle this.

Judge Lamberth: Certainly.

Founder: ..the part where Obama testified where he was born, his parents' names and citizenship.

Recorder: "I was born at Queen's Med.. err, I mean Kapi'olani Medical Center on August 4th, 1961 in Honolulu, Hawaii. My mother's name was Ann Dunham. I am an American, a 'native born' Citizen."

Founder: Thank you. Mr. Obama, you were asked to state your parents' names as in plural. You only testified as to your mother's name. Please tell us your father's name.

Obama: Barack Hussein Obama, Sr.

Founder: Where was your father born?

Obama: Kenya.

Founder: What was your father doing in the United States when he met your mother?

Obama: He was attending the University of Hawaii.

Founder: Was he attending school on a grant or scholarship?

Obama: I don't know.

Founder: When did your mother marry Barack Obama Sr.

Obama: I am not exactly sure what the date was. It was before I was born, I know that.

{{ the Court broke out in laughter }}

Founder: How long was Barack Obama, Sr. married to your mother?

Obama: I don't know exactly. My mother never discussed dates with me.

Founder: Did your mother divorce Barack Obama, Sr.?

Obama: Yes.

Founder: Did your mother ever remarry?

Obama: Yes.

Founder: What was your stepfather's name?

Obama: Lolo Soetoro.

Founder: Did you ever go by any other name than Barack Obama?

Obama: Well no, not really.. Well, for a short time I went by Barry Soetoro.

Founder: When did you start to use the name Barry Soetoro?

Obama: In Indonesia when my stepfather adopted me.

Founder: When you returned to the United States did you continue to use the name Barry Soetoro?

Obama: Well no.. well yes, maybe for a short period of time.

Founder: Let me jump ahead here. Most of this is irrelevant except for the "legal purposes" in declaring your name.

Obama: What do you mean "for legal purposes?"

Founder: I will get to that right now. Please tell us the name you used when applying for your law license in Illinois?

up to avoid criminal prosecution.

Obama: That's a lie.

Founder: The Illinois Bar application has a question that asks if you had ever used any former legal names. Did you state on the application that you had two names, Barry Soetoro and Barack Obama?

Obama: What difference does it make? What does it have to do with this trial anyway?

Founder: It goes to honesty and telling the truth Mr. Obama. This entire trial is about your telling the truth.

Founder: I am assuming you gave up your license so as not to be caught in a lie. Is that correct?

Obama: No, it's not!

Founder: Fine, Mr. Obama, let's move on.

Founder: Was your father a Citizen of Kenya?

Obama: I don't know.

Founder: Was he a British Citizen?

Obama: I don't know?

Founder: Oh come now Mr. Obama, what do you know about your father?

Obama: Very little!

Founder: You were a Constitutional scholar in college, yes?

Obama: That's correct!

Founder: Did you ever read the Constitution?

Obama: What do you mean, did I ever read the Constitution? Of course I did.

Founder: Can you please tell us about Article 2, Section 1 of the Constitution?

Obama: You mean the article you have been talking about in this courtroom?

Founder: Yes!

Obama: It applies to qualifications for a person to serve as President.

Founder: Are you familiar with Article 2, Section 1.

Obama: Yes!

Founder: Please quote it for the Court?

Obama: I am paraphrasing, "no person except a 'native born' Citizen may serve as President."

Founder: You mean "natural born" not "native born", correct?

Obama: What did I say?

Founder: You said "native born."

Obama: Well, I guess you are right. What's the difference? "Native, natural", both terms basically mean the same thing. Born in this Country of native soil. That is my understanding of the Article.

Founder: Do you consider yourself "natural born" as it applies to your U.S. Citizenship?

Founder: Are you a “natural born” Citizen?

Obama: I am a “native born” Citizen and that should be good enough for the likes of this Court.

Founder: So you admit you are not a “natural born” Citizen?

Obama: I am not sure. Please tell me what I have to do to qualify as a “natural born” Citizen?

Founder: Your mother and father must have been United States Citizens at the time of your birth. Was you father ever a United States Citizen?

Obama: Well.. I am not sure. I guess I would have to say no. I think I wrote something about it in my book.

Founder: Which book was that?

Obama: *Dreams of my Father.*

Founder: So we are clear now. Your father was not a U.S. Citizen?

Obama: Okay, whatever you say.

Founder: Mr. Obama, I am not going to keep you much longer. I do have one question that I am sure most folks are wondering. You have been asked many times to submit your “long-form” Birth Certificate to the courts for the public to see. To my knowledge you have never complied with that request and have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars trying to keep the document from being disclosed. Please tell us why you have refused to show such a document?

Obama: Because I am the President and it is none of their damn business, that’s why!

Founder: Okay Mr. Obama, I have no further questions. Thank you!

Judge Lamberth: It looks like we have concluded the testimony portion of the trial. We will now hear closing arguments by both Prosecution and Defense. Mr. Founder, are you ready to present your closing arguments?

Founder: Yes, your Honor!

Founder: Good Afternoon ladies and gentlemen of the Jury. If it pleases the Jury I would like to summarize the charge against Mr. Obama and then detail why we believe he is guilty.

Mr. Obama has been charged with fraud against the people of the United States and the Constitution, which implies treason. Many use the term “Eligibility” fraud. The Prosecution agrees with this term. Barack Obama did willfully and intentionally commit such fraud by withholding from the electorate his true citizenship status. Mr. Obama is not a “natural born” Citizen as required by Article 2, Section 1 of the Constitution to be eligible to the Office of the Presidency. Mr. Obama, in addition, with the help and knowledge of Nancy Pelosi and the Democratic National Convention did allow his name to be placed on the national ballot in 49 of the 50 States without declaring himself to be Constitutionally eligible. In fact, we now find that such specific wording needed to declare Mr. Obama as Constitutionally eligible was missing from the “Official Certification of Nomination.” It is obvious that the intent was to hide the truth from the electorate. Such a collusion of fraud is known as a conspiracy. This conspiracy involves all who signed or acknowledged the “Certification of Nomination” and distributed the Certification to the States. It also involved all who would have known about Obama being ineligible at the time of signing and distributing the Certification.

Mr. Crock for the Defense will tell you that Mr. Obama is a very well liked within his Party. He will tell you that 53% of all voting Americans voted for Mr. Obama. He will further tell you that Mr. Obama is a Citizen of the United States and therefore should be accorded all rights and privileges thereof. Mr. Crock will use such terms as “native born” and “Certification” to assure the jury that indeed Mr. Obama is a legal U.S. Citizen. Mr. Crock will further tell you that the Constitution is a document that is an instrument of the people and as such should bend and weave with the will of the people. He will basically imply that we should not read the Constitution in a literal or legal sense; instead, we should use the Constitution only in cases of extreme circumstances where people’s rights and privileges are violated. If fact, Mr. Crock may even argue that the Constitution is totally unnecessary as it applies to the Presidency of the United States. Mr. Crock will say that the people duly elected Mr. Obama and that such elective voice in “modern times” is all that is necessary to place a person into Office.

The truth of the matter, Mr. Crock would be wrong on all suggestions. We are not a nation of popularity contests, we are a nation of laws. The wording within the Constitution is very clear and exact. “No person except a ‘natural born’ Citizen is eligible to hold Office of the President.” Mr. Obama by his own admission declared his father to not be a U.S. Citizen at

Obama is not a “natural born” Citizen as required by the Constitution. He is probably a “dual” Citizen and he may be an “illegal alien.” Nothing in Barack Obama’s birth history points to him being legally qualified to hold the Office of the Presidency. When questioned on the stand all Mr. Obama could say was that he is a “native born” Citizen. Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, there is a very distinct difference between that of a “natural born” and a “native born” Citizen. “Native born” does not qualify according to the Constitution.

The most damning evidence however is the “Official Certification of Nomination” that was presented to the electorate by the Democratic National Convention. Wording in the Certification that is intended to assure the public that the official nomination of the Party was indeed a Constitutionally eligible person was intentionally removed. Without the Democratic National Convention certifying the fact that Obama was a “natural born” Citizen every vote placed by a trusting electorate for Barack Obama was placed under the DNC umbrella of fraud.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, for these reasons the Prosecution asks that Barack Obama be found guilty of Eligibility Fraud and Treason. The evidence and facts are overwhelming and conclusive. No other verdict should be acceptable in your minds. Trust the Constitution when casting your vote. The “natural born” clause was placed in the Constitution by our Founding Fathers for very specific reason. Such reason as it directly applies to Barack Obama’s ineligibility is now more important than ever as each member of this Jury makes his or her decision.

Thank you.

Your Honor, the Prosecution rests.

Judge Lamberth: Mr. Crock. Are you ready to make your closing arguments to the Jury?

Crock: Yes, your Honor.

Crock: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury. Thank you for sitting through this trial. I know it has been very painful for many of you. Many of you in this jury voted for President Obama. I am sure you are aware of his fine background and record whereby he entered public service as first a United States Senator and later became President. Few men in history ever attain such an honor of becoming President. A person may only assume the Presidency by being elected.

You heard the President say in his own words that he is a “native born” Citizen of the United States. My esteemed colleague, Mr. Founder, would have us believe that being a Citizen of our Great Nation isn’t good enough. He argued that in collusion with Nancy Pelosi that he lied to the American public. There is no evidence to prove such a charge. If Nancy Pelosi lied to the American public then that reflects upon her and the Democratic National Convention, not President Obama.

President Obama has been a good Commander-in-Chief as evident by his record of taking care of business in the Middle East. Domestically, through hard work and effort the President has managed to pass legislation that no other President has ever been able to do in our Country, that of Comprehensive Health Care for our citizens, doctors and health providers.

President Obama is a very busy man and has given graciously of his time to be at this trial to defend his honor.

The Defense believes the indictment against Barack Obama has nothing to do with Eligibility but rather is a vendetta undertaken by the political right to attack and demean the President’s fine character.

In good faith the President submitted evidence of his birth and Citizenship by providing to the Court a copy of the “Certification of Live Birth” from the State of Hawaii. We see no reason why such document should not be accepted and certified by this Court as satisfactory.

In response to the charges of Eligibility Fraud and Treason we submit that the indictment against Barack Obama lacks standing and is without merit.

We ask that the Jury return a verdict of “not guilty” so the President can get back to the business of running the Country.

Thank you.

Crock: Your Honor, the Defense rests.

Judge Lamberth: The Prosecution and Defense have now concluded their testimony, examination and arguments before the Jury. The decision process will now be handed over to the Jury.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury: You will now review the evidence and testimony submitted by both sides. Please do



If you would like to leave a comment go here:

<http://AmericanGrandJury.org/eligibility-fraud-and-treason-trial-of-barack-obama>

Permalink for this Trial:

<http://AmericanGrandJury.org/public/trial/>