

## Incompetence At The Highest Level

Last week I heard President Obama speak words that no President would be expected to speak. They were words that any competent leader at almost any level would know were incorrect.

The first time I heard those words spoken by a leader was a few years ago. I was paying partial attention to an African-American TV interviewee who I believe was identified as the Deputy Attorney General of the United States, though it may have been Assistant A.G. Either way, he made a mistake in misspeaking the words; "Attorneys General", which he erroneously twisted into "Attorney Generals".

Now I'm no lawyer so if I hadn't heard some talking-head on some TV news discussion panel inform the audience of what the correct terminology is, I certainly wouldn't have known the difference nor recognized it when hearing it.

But when I learned the correct form, -where to put the "s" when speaking in the plural, I took a mental note of it because I figured that someday I might be in a conversation with intelligent, educated people who otherwise might look at me in a less than equal light if I made such an uninformed error.

I personally wouldn't expect anyone but attorneys and those who deal in the law to be aware of what is correct and incorrect, but I absolutely expect real attorneys to know the difference. How could they not? Wouldn't that be something that they'd learn in their first year of law school? How could one make it all the way through law school, pass the bar exams, work in the field of American jurisprudence at the highest level, and make such a mistake? The first thought that came to mind (and the only thought) was Affirmative Action hiring.

Now I've heard the President of the United States make the same unbelievable mistake. It wouldn't be so bad but for the fact that he was previously a licensed attorney and university lecturer on the law. I just described him as "previously" being an attorney, but he no

longer is. Why? Probably for the same reason that his wife surrendered her law license, which very possibly was lack of adequate competence.

It brings the competence of Michael Jackson's doctor to mind. Some people just are not competent in the occupations that they have somehow become licensed in. How does that happen? Again, what comes to mind is Affirmative Action.

How could any attorney make such an error if he truly had the intellectual capability that a law license represents? Even non-attorneys like myself know better, having learned the correct usage from just one sentence spoken by someone I can't even remember. It's quite possible to misspeak but then one's mental faculties would catch the error and one would correct himself. That didn't happen.

That implies that the speaker didn't recognize that what he said was an error. In Obama's case, that wasn't the first time.

Who can forget, even though the media totally overlooked it, -except for Fox, that the current President when speaking to a crowd of military personnel pronounced "Navy Corpsemen" as: "Navy Corpsemen", not once, but three times. Was he really certain that that was the correct pronunciation, or was he just over-confident in his own Presidential competence?

Was he too proud to ask someone which was correct? While it's a national embarrassment to hear such a mistake coming from our elected leader, I could only cringe with sympathy for him, remembering the time when I was reading the same words and wondering which pronunciation would be correct. That was a long time ago, -before I joined the Marine Corps (not the Marine Corpse, -something that no Marxist-friends-&-professors-embracing radical ever came within a million miles of doing).

What's the point of pointing out this error? It's to shed light on the "black hole" nature of his hidden academic record. If one's record and writings could garner respect, one

is because they would not garner respect, but instead, disrespect.

Incompetence results in results that are not respectable, and that fact is the only reason why this President has kept his academic history in a locked box, -the first phantom president, the only modern President of the internet age who doesn't live up to his intellectual reputation. It's not that he's not intelligent, because he is, but he is, and always has been, in his words, "kind of lazy", -and laziness results in academic mediocrity. Academic mediocrity doesn't get one very far in the academic world unless some very influential backer(s) open doors for you, write different rules for you, and just "accept you as you are". Of course the end result of such support is the first Affirmative Action President.

How did such a man become President of the United States? Because no one vetted him.

They didn't investigate his record in government (since he hardly had one), nor in academia, nor his associates (including Reverend Wright who espoused Black Liberation Theology -pro-black Marxism), and worse of all, they didn't even confirm his constitutional eligibility to be President.

All who ignorantly assumed he was eligible were fooled by a misunderstanding that springs from an ancient philosophy that was developed to defend and legitimize the autocratic rule of monarchs. It was known as The Divine Right of Kings, and was based on religious philosophy supposedly supported by the Holy Scripture. Under its application, the King owned everything grown or born on his lands. On a national level, that translated to the rule that all persons born in his realm were his subjects for life, and had no right to renounce the allegiance that they "owed" their sovereign when becoming members of another nation (America).

In the colonies, everyone born there in the King's foreign territories, belonged to him by

having been born on his land. His claim to them supposedly ended with the Peace Treaty of 1783. But due to violating it by kidnapping naturalized British-Americans from ships at sea, the United States could tolerate such behavior no more and with only 3 Navy Ships they declared war on the most powerful nation on Earth.

But the idea that remained entrenched in the American psyche was that by being born within the government's domain, one belongs to the government just as one previously belonged to the King even though in a free republic, the government belongs to the people, -not the other way around.

Today, we're still suffering the effect of that misconception even though it's not embodied in any law that governs the citizenship of those born to American parents. Their citizenship is not a result of any law ever passed. It's not found in the Constitution. It's not guaranteed by any court ruling. It exists as a fact that pre-dates the Constitution. It exists as a natural right of man, -the right of parents to be the one and only "owner" and authority over their own children, and to pass to them that which is naturally theirs by inheritance, -which is membership in the parent's group/ tribe/ clan/state/ nation.

Obama is assumed to possess American citizenship because he produced two digital images representing two Hawaiian birth documents, with the assumption being that he "belonged" to the U.S. government (via citizenship) by birth within its borders rather than belonging to his parents and their groups by the law of natural membership.

How does the distinction translate in a legal sense? Simple. By the 14th Amendment, citizenship is conferred upon anyone born in the United States *and* fully subject to all the dictates of Washington that pertain to U.S. citizens and legal immigrants. That's what the 14th Amendment requires, but the problem is that babies aren't subject to any authority except that of nature (and their parents),

-not the federal government.

Therefore one must assume that the jurisdiction of the government is ascribed to the child through the father, or single mother. But if the parent is not subject to the authority of the United States federal government, then neither is the child.

Such was the case of Obama Sr. And Obama Jr. The father wasn't a citizen, nor an immigrant, but merely an foreign student who was a guest of the United States via a student visa, and covered by international treaty. Therefore the 14th Amendment didn't apply to his son through him.

But his mother was a U.S. citizen and her citizenship *was* passed to her son but not through the 14th Amendment because when it was written the citizenship of American women was not ascribed to their children. It was the citizenship of the father that determined the citizenship of his children. It wasn't until sometime near the middle of the 20th Century that U.S. Nationality law allowed the children of American women to have their mother's citizenship. That made Obama a statutory citizen as opposed to what the Constitution requires, -which is a natural citizen, -one born as a U.S. citizen via transmission of the father's American citizenship to his off-spring.

So the wide-spread misconception that Barack Obama obtained U.S. Citizenship because of where he was born resulted in a situation wherein nobody who was ignorant, spineless, or indifferent-&-silent challenged his eligibility to be the President. And no one in authority or the media will challenge it in the future election. Truly, we've become a nation of "see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil" as our Affirmative Action President waltzes into re-nomination for another unconstitutional run for the office of President of the United States.

His candidacy will be as legitimate as the Solyndra give-away and the Fast & Furious assault weapons transfers and the cover-up

that's ensuing. Arrogance, incompetence, and a willingness to violate the Constitution and surround oneself with like-minded people is what the Democrat party will once again offer the American people. They'll all vote for him again. The question is what will the independents do?

With the nation remaining in the state it's in, they'll either judge him on his competence, which will be found wanting, or judge him on his appeal, which remains intact. Will the election be another beauty pageant, -another coronation determined by his popularity with women voters, or an election determined by the merits of what each candidate offers for solving the problems of the present and the future. The fate of tomorrow truly is riding on the outcome of who we choose today.

by a.r. nash <http://obama--nation.com>