

The More Things Change...

“MACHIAVELLI RULES”

by [Joseph DeMaio](#), ©2016



(Jan. 2, 2016) — **Introduction**

As the new year begins, one is tempted to observe (with a tip of the cap to [Alphonse Karr](#)) that “the more things change, the more they stay the same.”

The continually-metastasizing cascade of misinformation and defalcations from the regime headquartered at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, facilitated by its media sycophants, takes ever-changing forms. But the underlying question always remains the same: is the current occupant of the White House constitutionally eligible to hold the office, or, as increasingly seems apparent (at least for anyone willing to objectively view the evidence), is he instead the Nation’s second bona-fide “Usurper-in-Chief?” [Chester A. Arthur](#) may have been the first. Your faithful servant, of course, believes the current occupant of the White House to be clearly ineligible and thus, a common usurper.

So, as a 2016 New Year’s Day public service refresher course for devoted P&E readers, as well as a brief introductory tutorial for newcomers, the following is humbly offered.

First, whether a person (including the current resident at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue) is born in this nation or elsewhere, unless he/she is born to parents, **both** of whom at the time of the birth are **already** citizens of the nation, he/she is not a “natural born citizen” under the Constitution and is therefore ineligible to hold the office of the president. The later “naturalization” of one or the other of the parents and/or his/her renunciation of a previous “dual citizenship” status will change nothing. The details of these circumstances are discussed, among other places, [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).

Second, the fact that a person may post to the internet an image purporting to be a true copy of his/her birth certificate does absolutely **nothing** to prove or establish status as a “natural born citizen,” as required by the Constitution. Even if the internet-posted image supports a conclusion that he/she was actually born “in” the nation, if it also confirms that his/her parents were not – or at minimum, his/her father was not – at the time of birth, a United States citizen(s), then the image actually supports the conclusion that he/she is constitutionally **ineligible**. The details of this reality are discussed, as well as elsewhere, [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).

Third, when offered an opportunity to take possession of a document purporting to be a true, certified copy of a Hawaiian long-form birth certificate and claimed to confirm the constitutional eligibility of the current resident at 1600, do **not** ignore the offer. Instead, take **immediate** possession of the document and assure the one who has offered it that it will be returned following a forensic examination. The details of this blunder will be discussed hereafter.

Bear in mind that while the presidential eligibility issue should not be an academic or abstract question – the U.S. Constitution is, after all, the foundation of the nation rather than an academic abstraction – the likelihood of either the U.S. Supreme Court, the Congress or the mainstream media – or any combination of them – doing anything **at all** to rectify any current usurpation or prevent future usurpations is, on a scale of one to ten, a minus seventeen. The pandemic deficit of principle, moral character and political courage which presently infects each of those elements of our society, compounded by boredom over those who would dare to espouse a return to such concepts, will lead only to more derision and lampooning. The Founders would not be pleased.

So be it. The truth, as always, will eventually come out. Just ask Bill Clinton. Ready? Let us begin.

Substance

In the never-ending saga of the mainstream media’s effort to mis-report, mal-report and obfuscate the facts surrounding the Usurper-in-Chief’s constitutional ineligibility, an interesting tidbit showed up recently on the NBC “[Today](#)” show. The program featured a segment wherein NBC Today Show co-anchor Savannah Guthrie was interviewing Donald Trump by telephone.

Recall that Guthrie was the NBC White House legal correspondent back in 2011 when the usurper – with great fanfare and faux indignation – produced what he claimed was his original “long-form” Hawaiian birth certificate, with Guthrie “reporting” on the event. Recall as well (or if you did not already know, then now realize) that Guthrie graduated *magna cum laude* from the Georgetown University Law Center with a juris doctorate in 2002 and is [admitted to practice](#) law in both Arizona and the District of Columbia.

In the course of the interview, Guthrie brought up the topic of Trump’s assertions that, if Hillary Clinton was intent on playing the “women’s card,” then Trump believed that her husband’s sordid and abusive history with women (other than his wife) was “fair game” on the campaign trail. When Guthrie pressed Trump for specific references, the surname “Lewinsky” came up. Imagine that. The following exchange then took place (video at 1:05):

Guthrie: “You mention Monica Lewinsky... Lewinsky. Are you saying an alleged extra-marital affair, that of course he has now admitted, is that fair game?”

Trump: “It’s not ‘alleged.’ You said ‘alleged.’ I don’t think that’s ‘alleged.’”

Guthrie: “No, he’s admitted it, he’s admitted it.”

Trump: “If he’s admitted it, you don’t have to use the word ‘alleged.’”

Guthrie: “Right..., which is..., exactly.”

Once again, the true colors of the Today Show shine through, courtesy of Savannah Guthrie. By first festooning the question with an inaccurate term – “alleged” – and then quickly correcting herself, Guthrie simply dug her credibility pit deeper. The excavation of credibility pits at NBC seems to be a [growing trend](#), but is by no means confined to NBC. As one writer (now at the [The Daily Caller](#)) once noted: “Modern journalism is all about deciding which facts the public shouldn’t know because they might [reflect badly](#) on Democrats.

But I digress. Turning the tables, and refocusing the discussion on the eligibility issue, one is tempted to ask Guthrie:

Q: “On April 27, 2011, you reported on NBC news, where you work, that you had seen, touched and ‘felt the raised seal’ on a document said to be a certified copy of the president’s long-form birth certificate secured by his attorney from the Hawaii Department of Health, correct?”

A (presumed): “Yes.”

Q: “And this is a [video](#) of that report, correct?”

A: (presumed): “Yes.”

Q: “And you are a lawyer, correct?”

A: (presumed): “Yes.”

Q: “And as a matter of fact, you scored first on the Arizona bar exam in 2003 and are a member of the prestigious legal honor society, Order of the Coif, correct?”

A: (presumed): “Yes.”

Recall at this point that Savannah Guthrie is one of perhaps two known persons either not from the White House, or not from the law firm Perkins Coie – where practices one Judith Corley, intrepid courier-lawyer who valiantly overcame gigantic obstacles to retrieve two (2) certified copies of the document from Hawaii – who purports to have held and/or actually “touched and felt the raised seal” on the usurper’s long-form [Hawaiian birth certificate](#).

The other person who apparently had possession of the document (or a copy of it) was an NBC News correspondent, Ron Allen. On the same day that a certified copy of the purported “long-form” birth certificate was released by the White House in Washington, D.C., Allen tried to get “The Donald” to look at “the birth certificate” at a Trump campaign rally in New Hampshire. Guthrie claims (at 2:25 – 2:42) on the [video](#) that Mr. Allen tried three times to get Trump’s attention, asking him “[w]hy don’t you take a look at it?” while holding up a piece of paper, but then explains that Allen “was ignored.” It is unknown if the piece of paper Allen held out to Trump was (a) one of the exceedingly rare, actual certified copies; (b) a copy or fax of same; or (c) the usurper’s schedule of golf tee times for the week. Whatever it was, Trump did not accept Allen’s offer.

Memo to the Trump campaign: when an NBC reporter/correspondent offers you a document that Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio and personnel with his Cold Case Posse would salivate over possessing.... do *not* turn the offer away. If, following forensic examination, the document proves to be genuine, then your hope previously expressed that it would “check out beautifully” would be vindicated and at least *one* aspect of the controversy – the existence of an official Hawaiian long-form birth certificate showing a birth in Honolulu – would likely evaporate; Joe Arpaio would be further marginalized; and you would be lionized.

On the other hand, as noted above, if that same “genuine” birth certificate confirmed that either or both of his parents were not, at the date of birth, already U.S. citizens, you would clearly have had standing to seek judicial recourse to prevent him from being re-elected and serving his second term. What, pray tell, were you thinking... that Mitt Romney would ask for it? Having passed up that opportunity, some might be tempted to mutter: “You’re fired.”

But again, I digress.

Returning to the hypothetical questions one might pose to Ms. Guthrie:

Q: “You said you felt the raised seal on the document?”

A (presumed): “Yes.”

Q: “Did you examine the seal to determine whether it was from the proper Hawaiian authority?”

A (presumed or possible): “What do you mean?”

Q: “Was the seal from an official Hawaiian state agency, such as the Hawaiian Department of Health or even Mr. Onaka, the Hawaii Registrar of Vital Records?”

Here, let us spare Ms. Guthrie the distress of trying to answer even “presumptively” or “possibly” that question. Unless one has extraordinary vision or rubs the point of a No. 2 lead pencil over the striations of a seal impressed into paper, it is difficult to tell whether a seal is “official” or instead might be, for example, from the Secretary of [State of Agrabah](#). On the other hand, if Mr. Trump had accepted Mr. Allen’s offer, we might already know the answer. Returning, therefore, to Ms. Guthrie’s Q&A:

Q: “You stated in your April 27, 2011 report that the president’s own personal lawyer ‘had to get a special legal exception from Hawaii officials’ to get the document and then ‘travel physically to Hawaii to retrieve it,’ correct?”

A: “Yes.”

Q: “Did you also claim that the Hawaii long-form birth certificate was ‘by law unavailable for public release, even to Obama himself?’”

A: “Yes.”

Q: “Are you aware that, although a specific person’s long-form Hawaiian birth certificate is not available to the public without the subject person’s permission, if the subject person was, in reality and fact, actually born in Hawaii as confirmed by his permanent records, the person can obtain a certified copy of his/her birth certificate online for \$12.50?”

Once again, let us spare Guthrie the embarrassment of answering that question. While her statement that certified copies of Hawaiian birth certificates are not generally available to the public is accurate, it is quite “inaccurate” (sometimes also known as “false”) to suggest that they are by law “unavailable even to Obama himself.” It is akin to claiming that Bill Clinton had an “alleged” extra-marital affair with Monica Lewinsky.



Instead, those documents are in fact not only available – to a person *actually* born there, provided that the birth is confirmed through examination of the permanent official records kept by the Hawaii Department of Health – they can be ordered *online* and obtained by mail upon payment of a \$12.50 fee. And if you doubt that fact, go find someone who you know was *actually* born there and tell them to go online [here](#) and give it a try.

Accordingly, the suggestion that it was a “big deal” requiring a “special legal exception” and necessitating physical travel to Honolulu and retrieval by the president’s personal lawyer (*i.e.*, Judith Corley from Perkins Coie) is – let us remain polite here – nonsense.

The extravagant dog and pony show that was orchestrated by the players in this little kabuki theater show was little more than smoke and mirror camouflage intended to give the false impression that the usurper was “going the extra mile” to silence those “birthers,” because, as Guthrie put it (video at 0:47 – 1:18), he had decided “enough was enough” and that it was time to “put the issue to rest.” The usurper even complained that, in these trying times, he did not have the time to be distracted by “sideshowes and carnival barkers.” (video at 1:20 – 1:24). So there.

And yet, virtually hook, line and sinker, the electorate bought the charade, as well as its end product – the image of a birth certificate posted on an internet website – and swigged the snake oil on its way to the polls to re-elect the usurper.

But wait... there’s more... back to the Guthrie Q&A:

Q: “In the April 27, 2011 NBC News report, do you recall the president stating that he had ‘serious other stuff’ to do and could not spend all of his time ‘with my birth certificate plastered on my forehead?’” (video at 3:03)

A: “Yes.”

Q: “As opposed to the ‘raised seal’ certified copy of his birth certificate plastered on his forehead, do you consider the image of that document posted on the White House website to constitute the ‘best evidence’ of the document itself, thus purporting to confirm his eligibility as a ‘natural born citizen’ under the Constitution?”

One last time, let us pause in Ms. Guthrie’s questioning. As a lawyer – particularly one educated at the Georgetown University Law Center and a *magna cum laude* graduate of

same – it is inconceivable that she would be unfamiliar with the “best evidence rule.” As discussed [here](#), a picture of an original document is not the original document itself and is thus not the “best evidence” of the original. If the original exists and can be obtained, it alone is the “best evidence” of its [existence](#).

If one thinks that an internet image of one’s birth certificate is sufficient to get a passport, a driver’s license or Social Security benefits – unless one is, of course, an illegal alien or an un-vetted third-world refugee – try doing any one of those things with your smartphone or i-Pad. And yet, we have done that and more in order to debase the office of the presidency.

The claim that an internet image of a birth certificate is “good enough” to silence the unwashed masses – particularly those unwashed “birthers” – turns the best evidence rule on its head then, for good measure, shreds it into confetti. Happy New Year. Machiavelli rules.

And as for Ms. Guthrie: no further questions.