



Larry Sinclair's Story of Sex and Drugs With Obama Raises Troubling Questions

If anyone wants to know why Barack Obama apparently supported same-sex "marriage" in 1996, long before it was even an issue, Larry Sinclair's story may hold the answer. Sinclair is the man who says that in Chicago in 1999, he did drugs and twice had sex with a very willing Obama. And while his allegations aren't new, a recent interview he granted commentator Tucker Carlson did bring to light some troubling matters, the main of which is:

Did the media imperil our national security by burying the story?

Sinclair first came forward in 2008, telling a tale about how he and Obama did cocaine (Obama smoked his) and how he fellated the then-Illinois state senator. The 61-year-old Sinclair told Carlson in the recent interview, which aired last Wednesday on X (formerly Twitter), that he "was in Chicago looking for a party," and the politician was introduced to him as "Barack Obama," though he didn't know who Obama was at the time.

"I gave Barack \$250 to pay for coke and start putting a line on a CD tray, and just snort," he related. He stated that Obama knew just where to obtain the drugs.

"It was definitely not Barack's first time," Sinclair added in response to Carlson's question of whether the intercourse was transactional," the *New York Post* [relates](#). As for second times, Obama came back the next day for another sexual go-around, Sinclair also recalled.

For all the sordid details, you can listen to the entire interview [here](#). More important, however, are the deeper issues, though you wouldn't know it from mainstream media coverage. Even the aforementioned *Post*, for example, normally a sound paper, has tried to dismiss Sinclair's claims, [labeling](#) him a "fraudster."

Yet not only does Sinclair say he's been very open about what the *Post* references, his criminal past, but there's also this: Obama, like most politicians, is also a fraudster ("If you like your doctor...you can keep them," anyone?). Oh, his brand of "fraud," committed in a rarefied-air sphere, isn't legally actionable. It's far more damaging to the country, though.

Of course, as the *Post* points out, Sinclair can't substantiate his allegations in this "he said, he said" affair. But would media take this position had the claims been leveled against Donald Trump or, for that matter, any Republican? Was this required of Christine Blasey Ford when she dragged then-SCOTUS



AP Images
Barack Obama



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 12, 2023

nominee Brett Kavanaugh's name through the mud at a 2018 Senate Judiciary Committee hearing?

As for the troubling matters raised in the Carlson interview, the most significant concerns why some media buried the story: The "Obama campaign said that, if they reported on it, the campaign would blacklist them," [relates](#) American Thinker. "They chose access over investigative reporting and honesty. They also chose it over national security."

The last point is the issue. By definition, anything a politician desperately wants kept hidden provides leverage for possible blackmail to others — including hostile foreign actors. Was Obama blackmailed? We don't know any more than we know definitively if Sinclair's allegations are true. We don't know any more than we know if Joe Biden is being blackmailed over his family's illicit financial dealings. But this is why the media are supposed to shine the spotlight on candidates — *that's how they're vetted*.

As for other noteworthy points in the Carlson interview, American Thinker writes:

Sinclair also explained that he was very quickly locked out of YouTube. YouTube gave someone else access to his account after he took a polygraph test and then deleted the video. Microsoft, meanwhile, allowed someone else access to his Hotmail account, with that person circulating his emails on the internet and creating an obscene automatic response to any emails sent to the account.

The second interesting thing was Sinclair explaining how, in late 2007, he reached out to the Obama campaign suggesting that the campaign stop telling all sorts of conflicting stories about Obama's drug use. The campaign, he said, should just admit that Obama was still using drugs at least as late as 1999. Sinclair didn't hear back from the campaign. Instead, he heard from Donald Young, who explained that the campaign wouldn't acknowledge any sex or drug stories about Obama.

According to Sinclair, Young eventually told him that he was the gay choirmaster at the Reverend Wright's church, the one where Obama sat in the pews for 20 years as Wright blasted America. He also said that he had a long-term "intimate" relationship with Obama. Not long after that, Young was murdered in his apartment. Young's mother believes that it was to silence him (according to Sinclair).

American Thinker then reminds us that, according to [this 2009 article](#), Young wasn't alone but was among *three* homosexual men in Wright's congregation executed within a 40-day period. Did these unfortunates know too much about Obama and speak too loosely? We don't know.

As for my judgment, Sinclair seems sincere (either that, or he's among the best liars I've seen). I suspect that Obama does have a homosexual past. Remember that well before Sinclair surfaced, [there were rumors](#) that Obama was a member of the "Down Low Club" at Wright's church; this was a group of black men who wanted to engage in homosexual sex, but secretly so they could maintain community "respectability."

Then there's this: "In 1996, as a state Senate candidate, he [Obama] indicated support for gay marriage in a questionnaire," [related](#) ABC in 2012. While the site adds that "Obama aides later disavowed it and said it did not reflect the candidate's position," isn't that an odd mistake? Wouldn't it also be odd for an even remotely normal man to express support for same-sex "marriage" back in '96, when it was a fringe issue almost never discussed?



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 12, 2023

The only explanation is that Obama had an emotional vested interest in the issue (i.e., homosexual passions) or that he was a civilization-upending, far-left radical (which he is), or both.

You can make up your own mind on these matters. What we can bet on, however, is that all this will continue to be kept on the down low.

For those interested, the full Sinclair interview is below.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

[Subscribe](#)