

# The Usurper of a Darker Shade

by [Joseph DeMaio](#), ©2022

## *Hypoc·ri·sy*

(Oct. 3, 2022) — Recently, your humble servant offered here at *The P&E* a [post](#) captioned, “The Tragic Mulatto of Martha’s Vineyard.” Some commenters took issue with the use of the term “tragic mulatto” in the title of that post, calling it a slur despite the fact that it comes from Obama’s own *Dreams From My Father* in describing how he was viewed in the eyes of others.

He could have used other terms, such as “mixed-race” or “bi-racial,” but neither he nor his editors strayed from the term he ultimately intentionally selected and used. This only underscores the oft-repeated observation here that, hypocrisy being the mother’s milk of liberals and the radical left, if it did not already exist, they would invent it at breakfast merely to survive until lunch.

The post was intended to highlight the racial hypocrisy of Barack Hussein Obama, Jr. in slandering Republicans in general and their “agenda” as being racist for fear that the United States was becoming populated by too many people of “darker shades,” ignoring, of course, the inconvenient fact that while he occupied the Oval Office, his regime deported thousands upon thousands of people of the same skin tone..., with nary a peep of protest by his sycophants. But that, of course, was when the laws against illegal immigration still meant something and were enforced. Oh, and coincidentally, it was a Democrat of a “darker shade” doing the deportations.

The commenter’s objection was that the term “tragic mulatto” was, purportedly, an offensive “slur” and “only [gave]... further ammunition to those who see critiques of Obama as veiled racism.” Soooo..., any “critique” of Obama is ..., racist? He is to be somehow immunized from criticism? Really?

If your humble servant cared one peso about whether Obama supporters viewed the term as ammo supporting a conclusion of “veiled racism,” that would be one thing. But he does not. Obama’s acolytes – sometimes colloquially referred to as “Obots” – see racism *everywhere*, from words to roads to condiments to mathematics to Dr. Seuss.



*[Thomas Sowell](#), now 90, did not complete high school traditionally, but rather, joined the U.S. Marine Corps, serving in the Korean conflict. He later obtained bachelor’s, master’s and doctorate degrees and has written nearly four dozen books ([public domain](#))*

As the brilliant African-American economist Thomas Sowell once [observed](#): “The word ‘racism’ is like ketchup. It can be put on practically anything – and demanding evidence makes you a ‘racist.’” For a partial list of the things Obots and their propaganda arms in the mass media deem to be “racist,” see [this](#). Ahhh..., if only everyone shared the intellect of the “darker shaded” Sowell.

But again, I digress.

The purpose of the prior post was twofold. In addition to Obama’s hypocrisy, it also sought to call him out on his refusal to address the continuing issue of his usurpation of the presidency because of his likely ineligibility as a “natural born Citizen” under the Constitution.

Despite the cries of “misinformation” from the Obots and the censoring of the opposing view that he was (and remains) something other than a “natural born Citizen” as contemplated by the Founders, the matter still lurks unresolved – and decidedly “unsettled” – in the background of his prior occupation of the Oval Office. And thus far, the Supreme Court has not been of much help.

However, to address the use of words less likely to be seen as “slurs,” your humble servant has entitled this offering as “The Usurper of a Darker Shade.” The “darker shade” term, of course, was used by Obama – without objection by those deeming “tragic mulatto” to be offensive – when slandering Republicans over their purported fears that the character of the nation would change because there were “too many people of a darker shade” now here.

Stated otherwise, if it is permissible for Obama to use that term to describe folks seen by Republicans as purportedly adversely changing the United States, why is it improper for your humble servant to use the same term to describe an individual he sees as having not only – as promised – “fundamentally changed” the [nation](#), but in the process endangered it as well? After all, did he not groom and bring us – maybe with the help of [2000 mules](#) – [Brandon](#) the Goof? Huh?

If Obama cannot prove that he was eligible to the presidency as a “natural born Citizen” as contemplated by the Founders rather than as concocted by the Congressional Research Service and his cadre of Obots, then the term “Usurper of a Darker Shade” should enter the lexicon of the debate. Moreover, the issue is not moot: recall that Obama still receives – and for the rest of his life will continue to receive – a six-figure presidential retirement stipend. If he usurped the presidency, those payments should stop..., and a refund of prior payments should be demanded.

As by now faithful readers of *The P&E* well know, your humble servant believes that Obama was not and is not a “natural born Citizen” as contemplated by the Founders. If he is, as his apparatchiks contend, a natural born Citizen as intended by the Founders, he should answer the questions posed in the prior post in an attempt to put the matter to rest.

Until then, he should also try to avoid the vulgar descriptions of President Trump attributed to him [here](#). If true, it would be oh-so-violative of the Martha’s Vineyard mantra that “hate has no home here...,” would it not? Or he could deny having uttered them. Your humble servant will wait for those responses.

In the meantime..., please pass the ketchup.