Hawaii's Non-Verification

In response to large volume of communications requesting that, in light of Sheriff Arpaio's findings of probable cause for forgery and fraud involving Barack Obama's posted long-form birth certificate and draft registration, Obama's Presidential eligibility be investigated, Ken Bennett, the Arizona Secretary of State, requested a verification of Obama's birth facts from the Hawaii Dept of Health. According to the communications posted at

http://tpmmuckraker.talkingpointsmemo.com/2012/05/ken_bennett_birther_hawaii_arizona_ema_ils.php?ref=fpnewsfeed, this is the content of Bennett's original request (bold numbers added to show the 3 kinds of verification originally requested, in the order in which I will address them):

Enclosed please find a request for a verification in lieu of a certified copy for the birth record of Barack Hussein Obama II. In addition to (1) the items to be verified in the attached form, please verify (2) the following items from the record of birth:

Department of Health File #151 61 10641

Time of birth: 7:24 p.m.

Name of hospital: Kapiolani Maternity and Gynecological Hospital

Age of father: 25

Birthplace of Father: Kenya, East Africa

Age of mother: 18

Birthplace of mother: Wichita, Kansas Date of signature of parent: 8-7-1961 Date of signature of attendant: 8-8-1961

Date accepted by local registrar: August-8 1961

Additionally, please verify (3) that the attached copy of the Certificate of Live Birth for Mr. Obama is a true and accurate representation of the original record in your files.

After 8 weeks of delay and insisting that Bennett had not yet proven that he was eligible to receive a verification, the Hawaii Attorney General's office spoke with Bennett and said that if Bennett "re-worded" his request they would consider responding to it. Shortly thereafter the following "verification" at the end of this article was issued (found at http://www.azcentral.com/12news/Obama-Verification.pdf). Bennett was quoted as saying that he received what he had asked for. So if we look at the difference between what he originally requested and what he received, we will know what he was required to change.

#1: The actual request form printed from the web was specifically withdrawn.

In addition to **the items to be verified in the attached form**, please verify the following items from the record of birth

In addition to this communication, Bennett copied a request form off the HDOH, filled it out, and sent it. The form to request a verification in lieu of a certified copy is the same form as to request a certified copy. The items on that form can be seen at http://hawaii.gov/health/vital-records/pdf/birth.pdf and include the date of birth, which is essential to Presidential eligibility.

Why was that specifically left out - apparently at the demand of the HI Attorney General's office?

The key, I believe, is this: The original request for items other than on the form said, "please verify the following items from the record of birth". This is a request to verify that those items are on the record of birth – NOT that those items are accurate.

Without that statement – for instance, if the form was just filled out, HRS 338-14.3 (found at http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol06_Ch0321-0344/HRS0338/HRS_0338-0014_0003.htm) says that:

(b) A verification shall be considered for all purposes certification that the vital event did occur and that the facts of the event are as stated by the applicant.

In other words, unless stated otherwise, the HDOH in a verification is actually certifying that the applicant's claims on the birth certificate are true. But that is problematic for the HDOH when the birth record in question is late and/or amended, because HRS 338-17 (found at http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol06_Ch0321-0344/HRS0338/HRS_0338-0017.htm) says:

§338-17 Late or altered certificate as evidence. The probative value of a "late" or "altered" certificate shall be determined by the judicial or administrative body or official before whom the certificate is offered as evidence. [L 1949, c 327, §21; RL 1955, §57-20; HRS §338-17; am L 1997, c 305, §4]

The State of Hawaii does not vouch for the accuracy of the claims on a late or amended birth certificate. That's why they have to be clearly marked as "LATE" or "ALTERED". And the computer-generated abstracts (COLB's) have a statement at the bottom: ANY ALTERATIONS INVALIDATE THIS CERTIFICATE. Late and altered birth certificates are legally non-valid. The State of Hawaii CANNOT verify the truth of the facts on a legally non-valid birth certificate. The Hawaii Attorney General's office would know that, and they would thus require that the request form itself be withdrawn.

But the way Bennett phrased his original non-form request indicates that he wants the HDOH to verify that those items are what is on the birth certificate – which is a different thing than verifying what the true, legally-probative facts are. And that is what the HDOH does. In his certifying statement Onaka says:

I certify that the information contained in the vital record on file with the Department of Health was used to verify the facts of the vital event.

He is certifying that the "verification" is based solely on the information contained in the vital record. Which is all Bennett asked for on the NON-FORM request. He only wanted to verify that these are the claims that were on the birth certificate.

And nowhere does either Bennett or this "verification" specify that the vital record in question be legally valid. If the form had been used, the facts would have to be verified by a legally-valid record. But the AG got rid of the requests on the form – even the birth date, which is critical to Presidential eligibility. The only way the birthdate even comes into the picture is by Onaka saying that the information on Obama's posted long-form matches what is on what they have – without saying whether the record they have is legally valid.

#2: "the following items from the record of birth" were allowed to be requested

This was the only part of the original request that the HI Attorney General allowed to remain as it was, and the 12 points were verified verbatim – simply verifying that this is what the document claims, as explained above. Which is all the HDOH CAN verify for a legally non-valid record. They can verify that the record exists and that it makes these specific claims. And that's what items 1-12 verify – and the certifying statement confirms that these are simply the claims as contained in the (legally non-valid. SSSSHHHH) record.

#3: The request for verification of Obama's online BC as a "true and accurate representation of the record" was withdrawn.

Additionally, please verify that the attached copy of the Certificate of Live Birth for Mr. Obama is a true and accurate representation of the original record in your files.

But the corresponding response on the "verification" is this:

Additionally, I verify that the information in the copy of the Certificate of Live Birth for Mr. Obama that you attached with your request matches the original record in our files.

The Hawaii Attorney General apparently told Ken Bennett not to ask for a verification that the birth certificate that Obama posted online is a true and accurate representation of the original record in the HDOH files. Onaka instead verified that the INFORMATION IN THAT COPY matches the original record in their files. IOW, Onaka is SPECIFICALLY NOT SAYING that what Obama posted accurately represents the actual birth certificate. They are refusing to verify that what Obama posted is a copy of the original. They are specifically making no comment on whether Obama posted what they sent him.

Probably because they know it was a forgery. Sheriff Arpaio's posse uncovered ample evidence of that. Videos about that can be accessed at http://www.teapartypowerhour.com Another video that make the blatancy of the forgery clear: http://www.youtube.com/watch popup?v=7s9StxsFIIY&feature=youtu.be

So if the information on the copy HI sent Obama was the same as what was on the forgery, then why make a forgery at all? Why did they have to manipulate the document to get a photo (with a very faint, nondescript seal, which is one of the red flags for a forgery) – as can be seen at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wa-SHnBb220) ? If the information is the same, then what is different?

Onaka's certification on that forgery gives the answer (emphasis mine):

"I certify this is a true copy **or abstract** of the record on file in the Hawaii State Department of Health."

There is good reason to believe that Obama's actual birth record is a compilation from different sources:

- Previous official responses by the HDOH have indirectly confirmed that Obama's birth certificate was amended around late-2006 (see
 http://butterdezillion.wordpress.com/2011/03/03/amendment-confirmation-for-dummies/
), and official responses by former OIP Director Paul Tsukiyama indicated that there are affidavits to support the claims on his birth certificate, which would only be necessary for late and/or amended birth certificates.
- 2. Former HDOH Director Chiyome Fukino has said that Obama's birth certificate is "half typed, half written", which would make sense for an incomplete typed birth certificate with supplemental affidavits to supply the information that was missing.
- 3. Fukino also said in a July 2009 press release that she had seen the vital records (plural) verifying (swearing) that Obama was born in Hawaii.
- 4. HI Governor Neil Abercrombie was quoted in a Star Advertiser column as saying there was something about Obama's birth "actually written down" (see http://www.staradvertiser.com/editorials/20110118 This is a collaborative endeavor.ht ml) but according to Mike Evans as recorded on radio interviews, Abercrombie said he was not able to find a birth certificate for Obama, not able to find a record of Obama's birth at any Hawaii hospital in spite of searching with a search warrant and Abercrombie said he never even saw Obama in Hawaii until he was T-ball age. (see http://butterdezillion.wordpress.com/2011/02/03/evans-abercrombie-says-no-proof-of-hi-birth/

5. The HDOH has apparently altered the BC#'s for both Stig Waidelich and Virginia Sunahara, according to HDOH spokesperson Janice Okubo's official responses saying that Oahu BC#'s were almost always given by the HDOH on the "date filed". The particular combination of a BC# being higher than BC's filed 3 days later is a very peculiar "fingerprint" that doesn't fit a normal hospital birth like either Obama's or Stig Waidelich, but does fit the extremely rare circumstances for Virginia Sunahara. And the database record for Virginia Sunahara had been changed to a different name at one point because a query for her birth record came up with no records. So the HDOH has been manipulating BC#'s on certified copies of COLB's and has apparently temporarily changed Virginia Sunahara's record. None of that would be necessary if Obama had a valid 1961 BC#. (See

http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/bloggers/2885916/posts?page=214#214, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/news/2885601/posts?page=72#72, and http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/bloggers/2885916/posts?page=241#241

If Obama's birth record was a combination of a birth certificate form that was initially filed by a local registrar (on the report of Obama's grandmother, for instance) but was left incomplete and thus had to be amended in 2006 to add the missing information, it would explain everything we see. The birth certificate would be required to have "LATE" and "ALTERED" stamped on the front of it, and a note would have to be made on the bottom line, recording what amendment was made, when, and what supporting documentation is in the supplementary file.

This would explain why Obama couldn't just post what the HDOH gave him, including the seal. The seal is positioned right where the affidavits supporting a late filing or amendment would be listed.

SUMMARY: So what we've got here is Onaka certifying that the claims on Obama's long-form match what they've got on the record in their office. But the Attorney General required Bennett to remove every part of his request that would have required Onaka to verify what's actually TRUE according to Hawaii's legal evidentiary standards. That's because Onaka can't legally verify the truth of anything claimed on a late, amended birth certificate like Obama's.

Aside from supporting the theory that Obama's record is late and amended, this "verification" is worthless, except to show

- that the HDOH at that particular moment had 151-61-10641 as Obama's file # (but that could be on his electronic file, which they can change back and forth whenever they want to, as demonstrated by the Virginia Sunahara situation.) AND
- 2. that the HDOH took special care to NOT SAY Obama's posted long-form is a genuine copy.

Department of Health 1250 Punchtow Street Tonolule, Hawaii 93813



Office of Health Status Monitoring P.C. Sox 3273 Honologi Hawaii 96801

Date Issued: May 22, 2012.

STATE OF HAWAII

VERIFICATION OF BIRTH

Recipient of Verification: Ken Bennett, Arizona Secretary of State

Pursuant to Hawaii Revised Statutes §338-14 3. I verify the following:

- 1 A birth certificate is on file with the Department of Health indicating that Barack Hussein Obama. If was born in Honolulu, Hawaii
- Name of Person: Barack Hussein Obama, II.
- Department of Health File #: 151 61 10641.
- Time of Birth: 7:24 p.m.;
- 5. Name of Hospital: Kapio ani Maternity & Gynecological Hospitali
- Age of Father: 25.
- Birthplace of Father. Kenya, East Africa.
- 8. Age of Mother: 18
- 9. Birthplace of Mother: Wichita, Kansas
- 10. Date of Signature of Parent: 8-7-61
- Date of Signature of Attendant: 5-8-61
- Date Accepted by Local Registrar: Aug-8 1961

Additionally, I verity that the information in the copy of the Certificate of Live Birth for Mr. Obama that you attached with your request matches the original record in our files.

! certify that the information contained in the vital record on file with the Dopartment of Health was used to verify the facts of the vital event.

almin Chesha Pass, ga

Alvin T. Onaka, Pก D. State Registrar