

Now It's Malik's Turn

by David Solway



Frank Marshall Davis and Barack Hussein Obama

Writing in *American Thinker* back in early 2011, Monte Kuligowski [recounts](#) how “Barack Hussein Obama, Jr., a/k/a Barry Soetoro, appeared out of nowhere as a political Melchizedek with a mysterious and unknown past.” It is not surprising that rivals and commentators have made an issue of his origins and credentials. Indeed, it seems that Obama’s eligibility for the Democratic presidential nomination was first [questioned by the Hillary camp](#) during the 2007/8 nomination cycle, focusing on Obama’s “otherness.” That Hillary, or “Hillaryland” as John Heilemann puts it in [Game Change](#), was apparently the first “birther” is now conveniently forgotten. Since then, a number of serious researchers have investigated the famous birth certificate, or rather, the digital copy, examining the many details that suggest it may well be a forgery, but so far without an iota of fair-minded treatment by the mainstream press.

Now a new controversy regarding Obama’s *bona fides* has arisen.

There is currently some debate about whether Malik Obama and Barack Obama, presumably sons of the same father, are, in fact, kindred. There is [speculation](#) that Barack may be the son of pedestrian poet and communist agitator Frank Marshall Davis. Joel Gilbert's documentary [Dreams from My Real Father](#) makes a case for the genetic link between Davis and Obama and furnishes a related reason for the absent *original* birth certificate: the parental slot in the original birth certificate, if it exists, may read *Father Unknown*—a possible reason for its suppression. For whatever it may be worth, it's also interesting to note that Barack Obama's full name incorporates not the generational suffix Jr. (son of) but the Roman numeral II (the second), a violation of [official genealogical usage](#) if the father is alive at the time of the son's birth.

None of these suppositions constitute incontrovertible proof of anything, but they do indicate how vexed the lineal and ratification issues continue to be. The veracity of the film has been defended in some places, debunked in others. Malik, for his part, sees a resemblance between Davis and his supposed half-brother, and has expressed a willingness to undergo DNA testing to determine the truth of their parentage. In addition, he has released a copy of what purports to be Obama's original birth certificate, setting his place of birth in Mombassa, Kenya.

The [Constitution](#) website reports that "Obama, 58, a longtime Democrat, said his 'deep disappointment' in his brother Barack's administration has led him to recently switch allegiance to 'the party of Lincoln.'" His revised political loyalties and the fact that his *soi-disant* half-brother is now out of office may explain his decision to bring forth new evidence at this time. While retaining a degree of skepticism regarding Malik's claim, *Constitution* is at least willing to leave the question open. The [Daily Mail](#), in contrast, has already decided. Convinced that Malik is "malicious" and

resentful, it accepts *without analysis* that the latest immanence of the birth certificate is, to put it paradoxically, the real forgery. At the same time, the paper assumes, again without analysis, that the digital copy released by the White House is an authentic facsimile of the original—an original that has never been seen and a facsimile that has been hotly contested for its numerous maculae.

That's how the game is played. The *Daily Mail*, like the rest of the legacy media, stubbornly refuses to subject what it surmises to be "the case" to minute and impartial forensic evaluation, receiving as given what has not been reliably proven. There is no assessment, only apodictic assertion. The digital copy is genuine, the version released by Malik is fraudulent, and there's an end to it. 'Nuff said.

Unsurprisingly, Malik's offer to undergo DNA testing has not been taken up. There is not the slightest doubt, however, as Paul Kengor has shown in [The Communist](#), that Obama was profoundly influenced and effectively recruited by Davis, whose ideas "bear[] an uncanny resemblance to Obama's own words and actions." One way or another, there is a proselytizing communist *in loco parentis*. But whether Barack is emulating Barack Obama I or Frank Marshall Davis is politically irrelevant. His conduct in office speaks for itself, just as his lack of a paper trail is no less vocal in suggesting an ulterior motive.

It is sensible to assume that the man who has occupied the most powerful political office on the planet should be above board on all significant counts and reasonably transparent to the electorate. This is plainly not the case with Obama, who is like the opposite of Albert von Chamisso's [Peter Schlemiel](#), a character who has no shadow. Obama is a shadow that has no body. He seems, as Kuligowski says, to have appeared out of nowhere. Identifying markers are sketchy. All his important records are vaulted. Biographical [discrepancies abound](#).

These are indisputable facts, not frivolous hypotheses. They should be looked into. That Obama was given a free pass before and during his time in office and is still being given the benefit of the doubt by the spaniel media beggars belief. We can safely presume that, barring an access of courage and integrity, those in positions of authority—politicians, pundits, editors, academics—will allow the issue to remain dormant. There is no point being stuck in the past, they will say—a palpable excuse to evade their civic and moral responsibilities, since Obama is very much present and capable of doing considerable damage to the body politic unless he is exposed for what he is—or isn't.

We know the entire leftist insurgency—the media, the professoriate, the fleet of Hollywood inflatables, the multitudes of indoctrinated students, the radical riffraff, the SJWs and Antifas, the coastal intellectuals, the talking heads, the feminists, the government bureaucracies, [a seditious judiciary](#), the Democrats, the RINOs—will go ballistic defending their precious misbegotten champion. And defending their champion means attacking a sitting president. What Michael Walsh has [called](#) a “rolling coup attempt” against Donald Trump and his administration is perfectly OK with progressivist opinion.

We know, too, that many of a conservative or Republican persuasion will tend to shy away from this particular controversy, wary of the racial slurs and public derision they will inevitably meet. But a little valor and a sense of principle can go a long way. Valor and principle are the qualities needed to preserve a [constitutional republic](#) and licit governance. Why then should decent people on the right be reluctant to pursue a frankly legitimate issue involving a former president who has [lied consistently](#) during his time in office and broken promises like eggs for the frying pan, whose provenance is uncertain, and whose documentation is undeniably problematic? Why not simply investigate?

Why, indeed.