

THE POLITICALLY INCORRECT BLACK AMERICAN HERO

February was Black History Month. But black explorer Matthew Henson (1866 – 1955), the co-discoverer of the North Pole, was not given much attention, even though his accomplishment could help safeguard America’s energy future. Henson planted the American flag at the Pole in 1909, giving the American people access to tens of billions of dollars worth of oil, gas, and minerals in the region.

Henson’s partner on the North Pole mission was U.S. Navy Commander Robert E. Peary.

In recognition of this great achievement, Henson’s body was interred at Arlington National Cemetery at the direction of President Ronald Reagan. Peary is also buried there.

The Henson/Peary mission has enormous geopolitical significance today, for the obvious reason that access to resources near, around and under the North Pole and other Arctic regions has drawn the interest of America’s rivals and potential enemies. Indeed, Henson’s contribution to black history was a contribution to American history and our future as a world power. But that assumes that our leaders have any desire to maintain that status.

Turner Network Television did a 1998 movie, entitled “Glory & Honor,” in honor of Henson and Peary, and a U.S. stamp was issued in 1986 in honor of both of them. There is a website devoted to Henson’s life.

This year—being the 100th anniversary of the Henson mission—is a great opportunity for the media to finally tell this story so

that the American people can develop an understanding of this important part of their history and Henson’s significance for the future.

Racism can be blamed for some of the lack of coverage of Henson’s North Pole discovery. But there is another reason why some may want to ignore his achievements. American conquering of foreign territories and

in the North Pole region. Under the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), which will soon be considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the world body would take control of many of those resources. Nations would get access to them by paying a global tax or fee and getting favorable rulings from international judges. Under UNCLOS, the U.S. and other nation-states would only get immediate access to certain resources within identifiable limits off their coastlines. In those areas, of course, radical environmentalists can already be counted on to keep them off-limits to the American people.

What would Matthew Henson, the black American co-discoverer of the North Pole, say about a U.N. treaty that undermines his achievement?

lands is not something that is celebrated these days because Marxists consider it a form of “imperialism.”

In the current context, too much attention to Henson’s discovery might get in the way of the push to have the United Nations assume control over tens of billions of dollars worth of oil, gas, and mineral resources in “international waters,” such as those

American Ownership

Support for UNCLOS reflects the fact that, as economic globalization proceeds, even in the face of a global economic crisis, there is an increasing tendency to put the fate of nations in the hands of international elites at the U.N. and elsewhere. However, under the legal Doctrine of Discovery, which predated UNCLOS, the resources in this region belong to the American people, not the world, because Americans discovered them. But it’s impossible to get the U.S. State Department to acknowledge this fact.

Despite the politically incorrect nature of the North Pole discovery, media interest and awareness is starting to grow. An epoxy bronze statue of Henson will be displayed at a special ceremony on April 6. This is the actual date, 100 years ago, when Henson planted an American flag at the Pole.



Matthew Henson

The political blindness on this issue is bipartisan and may frustrate a national effort to grasp the truth about Americans being the first to the Pole. Alaska Governor Sarah Palin got bad advice and sent a letter to Alaska's senators in 2007 endorsing UNCLOS as a means by which Alaska could gain access to Arctic resources. In fact, UNCLOS undermines the rightful and historical claims that Henson and Peary made in the name of the American people and nation.

The website devoted to Henson also celebrates the election of Barack Obama as the first black American president. But Obama, like Palin, wants the U.S. Senate to ratify UNCLOS, thus undermining the entire basis and findings of the Henson/Peary mission.

UNCLOS has been around for decades, but the campaign to ratify it

picked up in earnest under the Bush Administration and accelerated when the Russians sent a mini-sub under the Pole in August 2007 and "planted" their flag. The propaganda stunt caused some commentators to say that the U.S. would be cut out of lucrative Arctic resources unless we ratified UNCLOS. The reality of the mission was cast into doubt when it was later revealed that some of the film "footage" of the Russian sub that aired on a Russian government television channel was actually from the Hollywood movie "The Titanic."

The truth is that a U.S. Navy submarine, the USS Nautilus, was under the Pole about 50 years before the Russians, claiming the region for the United States. In his book, *First Under the North Pole*, Navy Commander William R. Anderson

wrote that as the Nautilus went under the Pole he declared, "for the United States and the United States Navy—the North Pole!" However, on the website of the U.S. Navy Submarine Force Museum, home of the Nautilus, this has been rewritten to be politically correct. Now it has Anderson saying, "For the world, our country, and the Navy—the North Pole." Notice how "the world" had now become a part owner.

The State Department has exhibited a disturbing tendency to ignore American claims to American resources. State's argument is that the number of U.S. ships is so low, down from about 600 under Reagan to only about 280 today, that we have to rely on the U.N. to safeguard our interests. An alternative would be to build more ships.

The number of U.S. ships is down from about 600 to 280.

REVIVAL OF THE PINK SWASTIKA?

By Dr. Scott Lively*

Repealing the ban on open homosexuals serving in the U.S. military would be a mistake of historic proportions but the mainstream media are turning a blind eye.

First, there would certainly be a mass exodus of normal men from a homosexualized military, leading to the reinstatement of compulsory service. The entire premise of a military system based on voluntary service is that young men will *want* to serve. But will normal men want to volunteer when they know they will share close quarters with other men for whom they will be objects of sexual interest? It is a recipe for huge morale problems.

Then there's the likelihood of physical conflict among the troops. Will proud young men being honed to become weapons of aggression against America's enemies

tolerate being ogled in the showers or touched inappropriately or bunking near sexually-active sodomites? Undoubtedly blood will spill over such (inevitable) indignities.

But what will be the political consequence? Once homosexuals are invited to serve, the authorities will be committed to integrate them into the ranks, which means "sensitivity" training, anti-discrimination policies, and all of the other "politically correct" nonsense that has been such a disaster in the other spheres of our society. These policies have smacked of pro-"gay" fascism in the civilian world; how much worse would it be in the rigidly-controlled environment of the military?

A sizable percentage of men would not willingly subject themselves to such an environment. So, ironically,

reinstatement of the draft would be made necessary by "homophobia," and for that reason the anti-war Lefties would suddenly become defenders of compulsory service.

Of course, no amount of "sensitivity training" will change the fundamental nature of young men and so it is likely that some form of segregated service would eventually be proposed. (We've seen this trend begin to arise in public education, where all-"gay" schools are the latest development.) This would be the biggest mistake of all, raising the

Dr. Scott Lively, a Massachusetts attorney and pastor, is co-author, along with Kevin E. Abrams, of **The Pink Swastika: Homosexuality in the Nazi Party. For more information please see www.defendthefamily.com*

specter (over time) of a homosexual takeover of the military branches.

Most people don't realize that male homosexuality does not always lean to the effeminate. Historically, male homosexuality was much more often associated with hyper-masculine warrior societies which were usually very brutal and very politically aggressive. The most recent example was in Germany. Hitler's initial power base when he launched the Nazi Party was a private homosexual military force organized and trained by a notorious pederast named Gerhard Rossbach. Rossbach's homosexual partner Ernst Roehm, who was also Hitler's partner in forming and building the Nazi Party, converted the "gay" Rossbachbund into the dreaded SA Brownshirts.

"Many of the [S.A.'s] top leaders, beginning with its chief, [Ernst] Roehm, were notorious homosexual perverts." wrote the preminent historian of the Nazi era, William Shirer in *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*.

The Homosexual Menace

In *The Homosexual Matrix*, C.A. Tripp writes that "[f]ar to the other extreme [opposite of effeminate 'gays'], there are a number of utterly masculine, sometimes supermasculine homosexuals....They are obsessed with

everything male and eschew anything weak or effeminate....Unquestionably they represent the epitome of what can happen when an eroticized maleness gains the full backing of a value system that supports it."

Danger Of Pedophiles

Masculine-oriented male homosexuality tends also to be pederastic in nature, meaning that it often involves relationships between adult men and teenage boys. The ancient Spartan army, for example, drafted young teen boys and paired them with adult homosexual soldiers. Brownshirt leaders in Germany recruited boys from the local high schools for sex. Roehm himself once briefly fled Germany for South America over a scandal involving a

The entry of "gays" in the military could lead to the establishment of "an army within an army."

young male prostitute. This bodes ill for the young men who will be our future draftees.

The scenario I see unfolding if we allow homosexuals to serve openly in the military is an initial period of turmoil in which members of the services would attempt to show their opposition through the limited means available to

them. This would result in a clamp-down by military authorities in an effort to force acceptance, accompanied by a sensitivity-training regimen. One or more incidents of violence against homosexuals, real or staged by the "gays" themselves, would ensure prioritization of the politically-correct policies, and justify pro-homosexual "affirmative action."

Next would come a severe drop in enlistments and re-enlistments, triggering the reinstatement of the draft. This would in turn begin a degeneration of the moral and ethical culture of the services as those with the highest personal values would be most likely to be leave, being replaced, in many cases, by men whose motivation is to share a male-dominated environment with others of similar sexual proclivities.

Whether or not a segregated service was initiated, a homosexual subculture of servicemen would form, characterized by intense internal loyalty and political ambition. Eventually, this "army within an army," buoyed by pro-homosexual "affirmative action," and the ability to act covertly (due to the fact that some would remain "closeted") would come to dominate the services. What would they do with such power?

WHO ATTACKED OUR ECONOMY?

By Diana West*

I want you to read something. It's a snatch of transcript from a C-SPAN interview with Rep. Paul Kanjorski, D-Pa., that has received zero coverage in what we think of as the mainstream media.

To set the C-SPAN scene, Kanjorski is harkening back to the middle of last September, when, as it happens, John McCain was enjoying his brief lead in the presidential polls and the economy as we knew it was

imploding. Here's what Kanjorski said:

"I was there when the Secretary (of the Treasury Hank Paulson) and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve (Ben Bernanke) came those days and talked to members of Congress about what was going on. It was about Sept. 15. Here's the facts, we don't even talk about these things.

"On Thursday at about 11 o'clock in the morning, the Federal Reserve noticed a tremendous drawdown of

money market accounts in the United States to the tune of \$550 billion, as being drawn out in the matter of an hour or two.

"The Treasury opened up its window to help. It pumped \$105 billion

Diana West is a contributing columnist for Townhall.com and author of the book, The Death of the Grown-up: How America's Arrested Development Is Bringing Down Western Civilization.

into the system and quickly realized that they could not stem the tide. We were having an electronic run on the banks. They decided to close the operation, close down the money accounts and announce a guarantee of \$250,000 per account so there wouldn't be further panic out there, and that's what actually happened."

Economic Collapse?

Kanjorski continued:

"If they had not done that, their estimation was that by 2 o'clock that afternoon, \$5.5 trillion would have been drawn out of the money market system of the United States, would have collapsed the entire economy system of the United States and within 24 hours the world economy would have collapsed.

"Now we talked at that time about what would happen if that happened. It would have been the end of our economic system and our political system as we know it. And that's why when they made the point we've got to do things quickly, we did."

These are staggering revelations. Given their sudden appearance out of the blue, you have to wonder, first, could they possibly be true? If so, why weren't we the people told about this \$550 billion electronic run on the banks? And why haven't we heard a word of it since? Even since Kanjorski spoke on C-SPAN, there has been scant MSM coverage.

The story's biggest exposure came when Rush Limbaugh played the audio and analyzed it on the air. Otherwise, the story has been little more than blogfodder, appearing at places such as Politico.com and the Economist blog with little comment. Writing at Portfolio.com this week, Felix Salmon quite decisively dismissed the whole story as "fiction."

Is it? If what Kanjorski says is "fiction," Americans, particularly Americans in Kanjorski's 11th district of Pennsylvania, need to know. After

all, this isn't a story that just goes away on its own, particularly not when Paul Kanjorski is chairman of the Capital Markets Subcommittee of the House Financial Services Committee. Of course, incredible as Kanjorski's revelations were, almost equally incredible was the interviewer's failure to ask the next obvious question of national interest: Who or what was responsible for that electronic run on the banks "to the tune of \$550 billion"?

That's where Limbaugh went with the story. "Now, let's assume for a second here that elements of this are

Rep. Kanjorski says a run on the banks threatened a U.S. political collapse. Who did it?

true," Limbaugh said of Kanjorski's statement. "Let's assume that there was a \$550 billion...electronic run on the banks and money market accounts in one to two hours. The question is who was doing this? Who was withdrawing all this money? And the next question is why? That's where my mind starts exploding, and this is dangerous to have these explosions going this way. Could it have been George Soros? Could it have been a consortium of countries—Russia, China, Venezuela—countries that are eager to have Barack Obama elected because they know that will make it easier for them to continue their own foreign policies in the world?"

I've heard serious people float similar theories regarding financial attacks on our economy emanating from the Middle East, but again, who knows?

Market Manipulations

One thing we do know is that former President Bush made extremely cryptic public statements regarding the stability of our markets at this time in question last September, statements

noted by Accuracy in Media's Cliff Kincaid. These began with a Sept. 18 Bush announcement that the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) was stepping up its enforcement action "against illegal market manipulation." As Kincaid wondered, manipulation "by whom or what? The President didn't say." On Sept. 19, President Bush further announced that the SEC had "launched rigorous enforcement actions to detect fraud and manipulation in the market. Anyone engaging in illegal financial transactions will be caught and persecuted (sic—good ol' W.)." Again, what was Bush talking about?

On that same day, Kincaid reports, "the SEC announced a 'sweeping expansion of its ongoing investigation into possible market manipulation in the securities of certain financial institutions.'" Why? What was going on? If ever there was a vital, compelling reason for congressional hearings, Kanjorski's "electronic run on the banks" story is it.

What You Can Do

Please send the enclosed postcards to William White, on the matter of homosexuality in the military; Robert Bazell, NBC News' chief science and health correspondent; and Adam Rochkind of Harper Collins publishers, about the book by Weather Underground terrorist Mark Rudd.

AIM REPORT is published twice monthly by Accuracy In Media. Annual subscriptions are \$25 to individuals. Contact AIM for Institutional and foreign subscriptions rates. AIM is recognized as a 501(c)3 organization by the IRS. Donations are tax deductible.