

Barry's Birth Certificate Cover-up, Part I


By Hugo Feugen, July 4, 2024

© Copyright 2017, 2024, Feugen Publishing, Inc.


Shortly before Sheriff Joe Arpaio left his post at the Maricopa County, Arizona Sheriff's Office (MCSO), he held a news conference jointly with the leader of his Cold Case Posse (CCP), Mike Zullo. The CCP's December 14, 2016 video presentation may be found at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1cHzwfkIX168JH8cSj4cKqrbM810WeRqo/view?usp=sharing>. (Having the video's context will shorten needed explanations here. The reader will do well now to view from that video's start up to the 2:38 timestamp, then continue reading here.) At 0:43 of the video, narrator says, in part, **"After five years of intense investigation, which included consultation with one of America's most respected forensic document investigators and a team of European media forensic experts, the MCSO has reached a conclusion utilizing forensic techniques both old and new. It is the opinion of the MCSO that the birth certificate ... belonging to Johanna Ah'Nee was in fact used as a source document in the digital creation of Barack Obama's (BHO) Long Form Birth Certificate (LFBC). Nine points of forgery in which words, letters, and hand-placed date stamps have been digitally copied from the Ah'Nee LFBC and pasted onto Obama's LFBC."**

The video showed blue rectangles for the same five fields on each LFBC. With a click-and-drag, those fields were brought over together from the Ah'Nee document to populate the analogous fields on the BHO LFBC. Those fields are: 6a, 6b, 7b, 7e and 7g. Shown below are extracts of individual fields from the three LFBCs under discussion. (Yellow indicates Johanna Ah'Nee's LFBC, Green indicates BHO's LFBC on green safety paper (GSP), and Gray/Aqua indicates the same BHO LFBC, but at a higher resolution.)


At the Obama White House TV presentation of BHO's LFBC on 4/27/2011, its information was printed only onto GSP. The White House later electronically distributed a PDF version thereof via the WhiteHouse.gov website, which included the GSP pattern as background. Members of the press received press kits (PK) on paper that included purportedly identical information (in a clearer, higher resolution than the GSP version) printed onto a gray/aqua background sheet (PK version). All images below are the highest digital resolution publicly available. Yet another form of the purportedly single, Hawai'i Department of Health (HDOH) source was provided by HDOH Director Loretta Fuddy and was made 4/27/2011 by Reporter Savannah Guthrie as a phone-based photo. That image will be covered in a companion article, as it was not mentioned in the CCP presentation under discussion here.




The 6a field contains the subtlest difference of these anomalous, CCP presentation-claimed cuts and pastings. Note the claimed source (top) has a solid 'H' for 'Honolulu' where the lower two, purportedly copied-to versions have a broken lower-right leg, just below the crossbar. Therefore, the unbroken 'H' Ah'Nee version could not reasonably have been a direct, unedited source for the two lower broken-'H' versions.




As both purported "to" BHO versions contain a raised 'O' not seen in the claimed source Ah'Nee version, Ah'Nee's 6b field cannot have been the direct source for the two lower BHO images.



As both purported "to" BHO versions have a slightly raised 'O' where the claimed source Ah'Nee version does not have a raised 'O', with only its 'u' being slightly raised, and its 'h' having no upper seraph (wing), Ah'Nee Field 7b cannot be the source as claimed.



As the purported "to," the BHO 'X's are both higher and more centered inside their respective boxes than the claimed source Ah'Nee 7e, the Ah'Nee 7e version cannot be the source for the two lower BHO images. It's surprisingly not even close!




As the purported "to" BHO 'X's are both higher and more to the right than the claimed source Ah'Nee version, the Ah'Nee version cannot be the source for the two lower 7g BHO images. This CCP "proof point" is also surprisingly not even close!

Although the resolution of the CCP video didn't easily allow the CCP presentation audience to see whether Ah'Nee's digital data actually appeared identically on the BHO LFBC, the zoomed-in fields above should make clear that it was not Ah'Nee's digitized data that were ultimately found in any of those five respective BHO LFBC fields, despite what "forensic document experts specializing in two separate forensic disciplines, who reside on two different continents" may have concluded and/or said about their research of the matter. In all cases concerning the fields noted above, the Ah'Nee text-and-graphic images differ significantly from what's seen on both essentially identical versions (GSP and gray) of those fields in the "to" BHO LFBC. The CCP claims that the fields were "brought over as a group" and are "relationally .. proportionate to each other" are left in tatters as simply being inexplicable and unnecessary, going well beyond the evidence. It can hardly matter than there may seem to be some "relational proportionality" from the same fields on a different LFBC when the basic data have already been shown not to be the same, despite assurances from multiple teams at a final press conference. Those claims reflect a self-evident lack of due diligence.

After reading this far, continue playing the press conference video up to 6:48 timestamp, pause it, then continue reading below.

The CCP narrator began by intoning, "Now let's look at the date stamps in box 20 and 22. In this case the stamps were brought over one at a time. But as we do this experiment, ask yourself, "What are that odds that two stamps in two separate boxes, stamped by hand 16 days apart would have the exact same angle in box 20 and the exact same angle in box 22?"

"Both [document examiner (groups)] agreed that these angles are identical on both the Obama document and the Ah'Nee document."



Note that these fields, 20 and 22, have been normalized orthogonally to rectify those fields, such that there is no skew in the forms themselves due to subtle physical placement inconsistencies on the copying digital scanner, as can be seen in the form's pre-printed field separator lines above, showing through evenly at the top and bottoms of each field box outline.

In the case of field 20, the Ah'Nee date is on a steeper slope (or angle) than the two lower BHO date stamps. For field 22 at right above, the Ah'Nee LFBC date stamp slope is shallower than the two (identical) BHO LFBC date stamps. Thus, neither Ah'Nee date slope (20 nor 22) is the same as the corresponding BHO LFBC date stamps, unlike what the CCP claimed. Field 20's differing slopes are not even close. In addition to the different slopes involved in both sets of date stamp comparisons, it should also be clear that the purported source existed as a black-and-white (B/W) image, while the BHO LFBC "to" images are generally grayscale copies, thus, these could not have been cut-and-pasted without involving a second, unneeded operation, even if their slopes had otherwise been the same.


Narrator: "When you have two separate documents with two hand-placed date stamps at the same angles, it should be obvious that a forgery has taken place." Perhaps if the "angles" had been precisely the same, it might represent some kind of evidence, yet when the angles (slopes) are actually very different, the data are different (e.g., '24' vs '-8'), and the field data are differentially seen in B/W versus gray-scale, both examining groups involved and the overseeing CCP should have seen that these fields supported no claim of forgery whatsoever.

The reader is encouraged to watch the remainder of the video, then continue reading below.

Narrator: "Now we're going to focus on boxes 6d and 6e within the Obama PDF. Both 'X's were taken from box 6d in the Ah'Nee LFBC. In fact, not only was the 'X' pulled over, but the box itself was pulled over and various parts of the line on top of the X were also pulled over, according to forensic document experts."

Hold on just a minute here! The video points to yellow circles around 6d and **7e** of the BHO LFBC, not 6e as the narrator stated. (Field 6e does not even exist. It seems likely the narrator simply recorded what should have been '7e' as '6e' accidentally and yet no team member or reviewer caught that mistake for this supremely important, culminating presentation.) As well, apparently no one at the CCP even noticed that that field 7e had been claimed already to have been copied over (see above), as one of the five fields that came "together as a group" onto their respective BHO fields. The reader will note that the earlier claim was already shown to be false above. The presentation contains two uncaught logical errors at this point! The apparently unnoticed but implicit CCP claim is that BHO 7e was copied onto twice, first from Ah'Nee's 7e but also a second time, as it got overwritten by Ah'Nee's 6d field. Logic escaped the CCP and their examiner group experts to see the effect of their claims. They first failed as they visually tried to justify the claim that the first copying step took place, then didn't realize that their claim about a later copy-over would have necessarily obliterated any vestige of the first copying. The CCP's presentation has by this time turned into an unrecognized, pratfalling comedy of errors! So, after this second, claimed copy-over, will BHO's 6d and 7e fields each at least be a match to the Ah'Nee 6d field? (Why ruin a perfect streak?)


Let's look at Ah'Nee's yellow field 6d to see whether it could have been the digital data source for either 6d and/or 7e on the BHO LFBC as claimed.



The answer is no; it couldn't have been the source, either for BHO's LFBC 6d field or for its 7e field. It should be apparent that:

- 1) Ah'Nee's 6d 'X' is not, nor is the box nor any parts of the line on top of the 'X', the source of the BHO 6d, as BHO's 'X' falls more to the left and not quite as high into their respective boxes. The 6d BHO 'X's cross-point is just a bit lower. See where the o's and commas above are contacted, or not.
- 2) Ah'Nee's 6d 'X' is not, nor is the box nor any parts of the line on top of the 'X', the source of the BHO 7e, as BHO's 7e 'X' falls more to the left in the box than it does in Ah'Nee's 6d. Also, Ah'Nee's 6d 'X' is lower in its box than is BHO 7e's 'X's. The 'o' above is contacted more to the left in the Ah'Nee 6d than in the BHO 7e examples.
- 3) The differences between BHO's PK 6d and 7e show that Ah'Nee's 6d could not have been the source for both, which is therefore at minimum an uncaught CCP mistake, as BHO's 6d and 7e are clearly different. BHO's 7e 'X' is higher. Also, one 'X' contacts the 'o' above while the other does not. The underlying original for both BHO 7e fields' data (GSP and PK) must be identical, unless anyone wishes to claim that forgery has been proved without further ado.

Even if the CCP's two consulting document examiner groups didn't originate the false claim of Ah'Nee's LFBC being the source for all the BHO fields noted above, those examiner groups' agreement—as asserted by the CCP—would represent a self-evidently incompetent doubling-down on CCP errors to confirm and/or endorse those mistakes. Apparently, the main reason the assembled press conference audience was not able to appreciate these errors at the time (since no news outlet is known to have written about it) was the fact that the presentation video used a projected image resolution that was too low to allow the audience to see subtle-yet-important differences. The audience apparently simply accepted what they were told what the investigation-derived results were. Attending mainstream media journalists were either insufficiently equipped with a scientific method or inclined to investigate further on their own to see whether CCP's claims could be replicated or independently verified.



The Latin phrase *Res ipso loquitur* is instructive about Barry's LFBC. By Hawai'i administrative rules, the Ah'Nee LFBC is itself invalid because it shows evidence of forgery, in that the second '9' and following '4' (above, as indicated by the red arrow) of its certificate serial number clearly overlap. The serial numbers on unaltered certificates were all stamped by a Bates stamp (image above-right). That device is mechanically incapable of producing such an overlap as the metallic/rubberized band of each digit is separated from the next digit by a serrated, metal finger wheel. Even if the number were the only falsified item for that LFBC, just as the HDOH is reasonably wont to say, "*ANY ALTERATIONS INVALIDATE THIS CERTIFICATE.*" (Part II will dig more deeply into this area.)

Given the 2016 election results that portended the arrival of a new sheriff in town, Zullo and his staff may have been too hasty to thoroughly check for possible glitches in their presentation and double-check their conclusions. Perhaps they felt pressured to adopt the outside forensic document examiners' views lest the burden of those groups' expenses appear to have been wastefully spent. Maybe Zullo's team was bamboozled by a hair-brained idea from someone important—a donor, perhaps, or a presentation consultant. Or maybe the CCP team itself were showing their own shortcomings, telling the audience things they wanted them to see, even though they couldn't really be sure they saw those things themselves.

While it may be true that Ah'Nee's LFBC was the only other such certificate than BHO's that was available to the CCP and released by Fuddy's HDOH, even up to the date of Fuddy's 12/11/2013 plane crash, what possibly misleading source of information could have suggested that Ah'Nee's LFBC should have been any more likely to be the digital source for copying than any of hundreds of thousands of other LFBCs to which an HDOH insider could have access? Why would there be any predisposition to infer BHO's LFBC was generated by a copy process from another other LFBC? Did such a rumor exist? (This would be especially true if one or more HDOH insiders were perhaps feeding the CCP information—good or otherwise.) It seems doubtful the CCP had very many LFBCs at all to consider as possible BHO digital data field donors. Why should fields from an extremely small percentage of existing LFBCs—let alone just one sample—be thought to contain copied source fields? Wouldn't that defy all odds of coincidence? What made Ah'Nee's certificate anything more than one needle in a very large haystack? Would not the merits of highly detailed, repeated forensic data matches be the only reasonable justification to claim a particular source? Yet when such matches prove not actually to exist, why would such obviously false hypotheticals continue to be pushed forward as fact at the culminating presentation of the findings of a five-year investigation? Was failure a desired outcome by one or more participants?

If the BHO LFBC was forged using source fields from another LFBC, wouldn't the person devising the forgery be clever enough to choose a non-public LFBC that no one was likely to possess, as opposed to a LFBC from a vital, living person or a LFBC that had been circulated publicly?

Certainly, no other group or individual on the planet looking at BHO's LFBC has received the amount of well-intended contributions and gotten the media attention that Sheriff Joe's CCP has. It's a shame the CCP had to sully its otherwise commendable work showing evidence of forgery on the BHO LFBC and Selective Service documents on such a sour note as this final presentation. Through the CCP's 5-year investigation, interim results properly discredited many theories that attempted to support the authenticity of the BHO LFBC. Thankfully, such results can remain useful despite the CCP's botched final news conference.

Flawed, unrelated-yet-juxtaposed digital data such as that represented by the Ah'Nee LFBC can prove very little through hubris or use of overheated, incompetent reasoning. Yet, that seemed to be the CCP's plan to bring their determination of likely forgery to a courtroom and/or congressional committee. In either such venue, cross-examination showing such things as has been presented here would have left Sheriff Arpaio, Mr. Zullo, the CCP's and their donors' reputations in shambles. The cause of those trusting in far more solid evidence that BHO's birth documents are invalid and don't substantiate that Barry is a natural born US citizen, as is constitutionally required for a president, should not rightly rest on the CCP's flawed, unofficial findings. Even so, Leftist detractors and the media would have had a field day heaping shrill ridicule upon so-called birthers' heads, had this final CCP evidence ever been paraded before a judicial proceeding or Congressional hearing.

Throughout its five years of activity, the CCP consistently used up most of the birth certificate “oxygen in the [media] room.” The CCP was often the in the crosshairs of the media’s so-called *birtherism* “flak.” Similarly, the CCP sucked up more donor dollars and more public mindshare via radio and TV interviews, for example, than has been afforded any other group looking into the questions of Barack Obama’s documentation for natural born legitimacy as president. Conceivably, that was according to someone’s plan and less-than-well-intentioned desires. These CCP final presentation results likely were intentionally someone’s burn barrel—where critique of Barry’s LFBC and ineligibility for the presidency would be brought to a discredited, fiery end. The motivation for such deconstruction should be clear: coverup.

Computer professional Dennis Montgomery has credibly claimed he was hired by former CIA Director John Brennan and former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, saying those Directors had him breach the Hawaii Vital Records for Obama’s benefit and to make changes to them from a remote terminal. Certain anomalies seen by this writer in the 1960-1964 HDOH birth index seem to verify at least some of Montgomery’s claims. Even though Sheriff Arpaio hired Montgomery to help the CCP, no substantiated claim related to Obama’s LFBC is known to have come through the CCP owing to Montgomery’s work product.

Though the CCP’s efforts never quite stimulated or catalyzed a sea change concerning Obama’s illegitimacy among American voters, the CCP nonetheless—whether intentionally or perhaps by media design—systematically isolated and diverted attention from other large, Deep State election-related propaganda activities such as the airplane crash in which Loretta Fuddy was falsely said to have died. That activity as well as the later Trump campaign spying and false Russia-Trump collusion used to justify FISA surveillance have taken place in support of the on-going *coup* by a basement-ensconced, truly illegitimately documented president and other Deep State powerbrokers: Hillary Clinton, Susan Rice, and Avril Haines, for example. The Trump campaign surveillance, with summaries provided in President Obama’s Daily Briefing, was only possible because the earlier LFBC and Fuddy plane crash hoaxes enjoyed insufficient public scrutiny. That is also because they were successfully covered up. Perpetrators in multiple, coordinating federal agencies and hired, Internet and corporate media cover-up artists have earned consideration for charges of seditious activity. For the most part, they’ve remained deeply embedded and are in some cases among the most well-paid Senior Executive Service members of the federal bureaucracy.

Perhaps it was not a lack of due diligence or incompetence that was the major problem at work within the CCP to cause it to arrive at faulty results. Could there have been an infiltration into the CCP by the same group that initiated the fraud of BHO’s false nativity documents (read: Deep State’s lapdogs within the FBI and/or intelligence community or later, notorious booksellers hogging the stage, as the Internet sensation Q would later post)? Could corruption have been at work inside the CCP and/or its forensic document consultants? After all, these errors under discussion potentially could have had very significant repercussions in the case against a two-term, successful usurper to the US presidency!

Could an infiltrator to the CCP have brought forward a corruptly devised theory that led other investigators astray, born in part owing to 1) deficient image resolution of the documents with which they were working, leaving interpretation up to the subjective eyes of insufficiently well-trained or competent beholders, leading to a spurious or incorrect theory that could not easily be identified, caught and stopped? Or 2) could multiple people have been paid off, threatened, or received threats against their families?

No matter what may have plagued or menaced the group, a large part of the responsibility for delivering no solid proof of forgery in their final summation after five years of investigation must fall on CCP investigative lead Mike Zullo. That’s not to say the CCP had not done some creditable work that reasonably weighed preponderantly toward a conclusion of forgery before its final press conference. As Sheriff Arpaio had a full-time “day job” all the while, it perhaps precluding him from necessary CCP oversight to avoid errors. Through those five years, Sheriff Arpaio apparently didn’t sufficiently appreciate the dangers that might accompany incorrect results—especially in the final summation—and what that could spell for the CCP and all the good toward which so many citizens had contributed financially. Inexplicably, out came mistake after mistake bound up in the CCP’s final conclusions, ostensibly through its vaunted document examiner professionals, “both foreign and domestic.”

No matter what errors some investigators might have made regarding the CCP’s verification of BHO’s LFBC, it would be wrong to conclude that BHO’s LFBC production is somehow absolved of forgery or that the LFBC is therefore actually a verified-authentic document simply because the CCP has discredited its own results by mistakes or otherwise, by sabotage or corruption.

None of what was uncovered in the foregoing exercise absolves what Loretta Fuddy put in motion as she procured a “successfully” fraudulent, forged LFBC for Barry, most likely from within her own HDOH. There is evidence of multiple acts of forgery and criminality going on at the HDOH during her tenure. Even thirteen years on, much still needs to be set aright. Many of the details

thereof are grist for Part II of this document. That chapter will show solid, independent proofs of fraud and forgery which quite reasonably should stand in the place of the MCSO CCP's deficient and troubled final findings, as the BHO LFBC is indeed rife with undeniable evidence of forgery!