

Guilt is everywhere, all-pervasive, and brought to us by the same scoundrels who once promised us easy liberation. A brief run-down: guilt for centuries of slavery, guilt for the oppression and rape of women, guilt for the Holocaust, guilt for the existence of the handicapped, guilt for eating and killing animals, guilt for being fat, guilt for not recycling your garbage, guilt for "desecrating the Earth."

Note that this guilt is never confined to the specific individuals, say, who enslaved or murdered or raped people. (There are, I dare say, very few enslavers left in America today—say a Southern slaveholder aged 150?) Effectiveness in inducing guilt comes precisely because the guilt is not specific but collective, extending throughout the world and apparently for all time.

In the old days, we reviled the Nazis for their doctrine of collective guilt; now we embrace the same Nazi concept as a vital feature of our ethical system. For confining guilt to specific criminals would not do, because it would not fit with what Joe Sobran has brilliantly called our doctrine of Accredited Victimology. Some groups are accorded the status of Official Victims; everyone not in the Victim groups,

are, therefore, criminals and Official Victimizers. The Victimizers are expected to feel guilty about the victims, and therefore—because there is no point to guilt without a payoff—to pay through the nose in money, privileges, and "empowerment" forever and ever without end. Amen.

There is never a way of getting out from under. And this is what our liberators have brought us. In return for old-fashioned Christianity and guilt about sex, they have brought us a new religion of Victimology and of the Goddess Nature. And even sex, the last bastion of hedonism, is no

longer guilt-free; what with the onslaught of "sex exploits women," and ravening condomania in the interest of "safe sex," it might be better to scrap the whole thing and go back to Christian guilt. Certainly it would be simpler and more peaceful.

As in all other aspects of our rotten culture, the only way to save the day is to raise the banner high and engage in a frontal and all-out onslaught against the Left Guilt-inducers. In such an onslaught lies the only hope of taking back our lives and our culture from these malignant pests and tyrants.

—M.N.R.

If anyone fails to give due public lip-service to a long list of solemnly avowed guilts, he is literally driven from public life.

LP Self-Destruction: The Lear Scandal

In the last couple of months, the Libertarian Party has careened downward, even more rapidly than usual, in its path of inexorable self-destruction.

The temptation of every ideological organization is to reverse means and ends: at first, the end is to spread the ideological gospel, and raising money is the means to attain that goal. But at some point, and this has happened to all too many libertarian organizations, the temptation takes over to make fundraising the only output, with the proclaimed, inflated goals only a means to extract more moolah from the deluded donors. As the Libertarian Party sinks in members, votes, and influence, the desperate ruling clique has frantically stepped up its fundraising to try to keep its salaries, creaky offices, and petty scams alive.

A recent scandal highlights this rapid degeneration: the nauseating fundraising strategy put into effect by Chairman David Walter; his Gemini Twin, "Assistant to the Chairman" Don Ernsberger; and Vice-Chairman Mary Gingell. Perry Willis, a Beloved Loser (Jonah) and pet of the Berglandista faction [who took over the national LP in alliance with Walter-Ernsberger in 1988], wrote the letter and Walter signed it, personalizing LP fundraising by engaging in heart-rending mourning about a specific Ameri-

can soldier who died in the invasion of Panama.

The name of the dead soldier, Phillip Lear, was mentioned in the Walter letter, as were the names of his "real parents," Harold and Miriam, of Westminster, South Carolina, and his "real girl friend, J e n e i c e LaCross," of Tacoma, Washington. Unfortunately, these real people were not contacted. Willis then proceeded to blame the death of Lear and the anguish of his parents and girl friend on the Bush war against drugs and the invasion of Panama. The letter then asserted that the drug war was not something "for which Philip [sic, the name is Phillip] Lear would willingly have paid" the price of his life.

And here, from his lofty perch of a priori historian, Walter declared that, "I don't need to have known him to give the answer."

It would be nice if Dave Walter had had the decency to try to find out. He should have been clued in by the fact that Phillip Lear was not a draftee, but a gung-ho Army Ranger who was all in favor of the war against drugs and the invasion of Panama. Of course, Lear should have been against these two actions, but after all it was his life, and not a life available to be "stolen" by the likes of a Dave Walter.

When Alan Lindsay, former NatCom member and former chairman of the Arkansas LP, found out about this scabrous fundraising letter, he made phone calls to Walter and the other guilty parties, urging them to apologize and to end such a fund-raising policy.

Walter turned over the problem to his *s i d e k i c k*, Ernsberger, who in typically tactful style, told Lindsay that he would "have to get use [sic] to a Libertarian party that talks about the hurts, fears, and *hopes of real human beings...like Phillip Lear.*" [Italics in the original.] "Our fundraising letters," Ernsberger went on, "are going to continue to talk about the most sensitive area of all interaction [sic] REAL HUMAN EMOTIONS AND

REAL LIFE." [Capitals in the original.] After illustrating several possible fundraising letters, Ernsberger reiterated that "We are going to be dealing with real human issues and talking about real victims of the state," and "if you can't stand that...Too Bad!" And on the bottom, "No reply necessary...don't waste my time." A helluva way for an LP official (albeit appointed) to treat one of his member-customers!

On receiving this arrogant manifesto, Lindsay promptly embarked on a one-man crusade to bring the truth about the fundraising policies of Walter-Ernsberger to the

LP members, to its donors, and to the American people—and specifically to alert the Lears and LaCross to the way their names have been misused by the LP for fundraising purposes. With competence and enthusiasm, he has been a veritable Commandante Alan in a successful guerrilla war against the massed resentment and stonewalling of the ruling clique of the Libertarian Party.

In a press release echoed in columns throughout the country, Lindsay asked, "Is there no decency left among libertarian fundraisers?" Lindsay added that "there was a real person named Phillip Lear.... He had his own philosophy. He was a person of real flesh and blood, blood he shed in defense of his country. He deserved to be treated as an individual, not as some straw man into whose mouth money grubbing politicians (of whatever party) may stuff words to suit their fundraising needs. Walter, lacking a corpse with a philosophy suited to the thesis of his letter, chose to strip a genuine human being of his history and his identity..., his very personhood...."

The Libertarian Party has not been able to get any media coverage for years. Upon the victory of Dave Walter at Philadelphia on Labor Day weekend 1989, the NatCom granted Tonie Nathan of Oregon (who had supported the Walter ticket at the convention) her long-cherished appointment as public relations director for \$18,000 a year [a pittance, of course, for a real public relations person, but apparently munificent for Ms. Nathan.] And yet, the only publicity the LP has acquired in years has been the exuberantly negative reaction to the Walter/

Commandante Alan has waged a successful guerrilla war against the massed resentment and stonewalling of the ruling clique of the Libertarian Party.

Lear crisis.

If the Walter-Gingell clique had had any smarts, they (in particular Chairman Walter, who signed the offending letter) would have apologized quickly and abjectly, and that would have been the end of it. But, typical of all scam merchants, they stonewalled and absolutely refused to apologize.

Media hammer blows began to rain on Walter & Co. P.J. Budahn, in the *Navy Times* (March 19) denounced Walter and the LP in a column entitled, "Surely there are limits when making a buck." The *Anderson (S.C.) Independent-Mail* (March 9) reported that Lear's father charged that the LP "are acting like a bunch of vultures," while Sgt. Major Victor Aviles, friend of Phillip Lear and liaison between the Army and the Lear family, denounced Walter: "I think it's very low down that somebody would capitalize on a family's tragedy. I'll be honest with you, if that letter is shown to the men in his [Lear's] unit, they might kneecap this guy."

Whenever good men begin to raise the cry of truth and justice, others will begin to flock to the cause. Fortunately for the Lindsay cause, Jeneice LaCross, the dead Phillip Lear's fiancée, turned out to be a highly intelligent, articulate young lady; instead of only being anguished at Walter's actions, Jeneice became fighting mad, joining the crusade. A meeting of the august LP NatCom was scheduled for the weekend of April 28-29 at Austin, Texas, and Jeneice determined to attend the meeting to demand an apology. Lindsay mobilized TV to film Jeneice's speech and the NatCom's reaction, while veterans groups and Rangers were

alerted, and the Walter clique were fearful that these latter groups, not well known as pacifists, might express their rage on Walter's and Ernsberger's hides. [In the event, the Army and veterans' groups did not show.]

Jeneice LaCross sent an eloquent "To Whom It May Concern" letter on March 14 to Walter and his NatCom, stating that Phillip Lear "gave the ultimate sacrifice for his country and his people. I am torn apart by what these members of the National Libertarian Party have done.... I am devastated how a person or persons can rob an individual, be it my fiancée or any other person, of his dignity, values, beliefs, and loves. How can they tear a person apart who is unable to defend himself, and rebuild him to fit their needs

to raise money. What have the people in this country come to when money is more important than a human being."

She concluded that "I am devastated, crushed, torn apart and appalled knowing what one individual has done to [Lear's name]. I swore on Phillip's grave that I would carry his name with me forever, and that I would forever defend his honor. David K. Walter, Chairman of the National Libertarian Party, has exploited for his own benefit the name, honor, and memory of my fiancée, Army Airborne Ranger Specialist Phillip Scott Lear."

What was Walter's reply? A long-winded and smarmy reaffirmation that he had done nothing wrong, lecturing her about the Libertarian Party doctrine of non-intervention and drug freedom. Then, after irrelevantly going on about the right of the LP to free speech in opposing the Panama

invasion, and whining about the threat of physical violence against him (a grisly note to someone whose loved one has just been killed), Walter asserted, in phony nobility, that he "will not be silenced," and that he stands by his letter and refuses to retract it.

In short, no apology from Walter, who also r e j e c t e d Jeneice's suggestion that the LP give up the

blood money [about \$10,000] gained from the letter, and turn it over to a charity approved by the Lear family. Give up money—Hah!

Just before the NatCom meeting, Paul Harasim, in a front page column of the influential *Houston Post* (April 25), denounced the "unconscionable" act of David K. Walter, entitling his column, "Making a buck off a dead man."

The interesting thing about the Walter & Co. response to the rising chorus of horror about his letter is that they obviously did not, and still don't, have a clue about why this negative reaction was

If the Walter-Gingell clique had had any smarts, they would have apologized quickly and abjectly.

taking place. So far has the Libertarian Party lost touch with the American people. The idea that, given their mind set, the LP will ever become influential or win the hearts and minds of America is a grisly joke. 1976 LP Presidential candidate Roger Lea MacBride wrote in vain to David Walter (April 4) denouncing his "highly manipulative use of the tragic death of Phillip Lear," and added that "it

seems to me an extraordinary example of one of the things the Party was founded not to do, use other persons without their consent."

As the pressure built up at Austin, the TV and press clamoring outside, and Jeniece LaCross denouncing them, a faction of the LP insisted that some apology be made. But Walter, the major culprit, did nothing.

An LP press release of April 20 reiterated Walter's condolences and aggressive non-apology, saying that perhaps "his party should probably have contacted Lear's family" before using his name, but then retracted even that apologetic note by pointing out that the letter "circulated only" to Libertarians—Oho! A "secret" letter! But initially, Walter told Lindsay that "he would be unembarrassed even if it [the letter] were published in the *New York Times*." Walter almost got his wish.

The most interesting part of the Nathan press release was the end: "Walter has apologized for the behavior of a disgruntled former

LP headquarters employee [Alan Lindsay] who exploited the situation by contacting Lear's family and the media." It was not a tactic calculated to impress the media, who, quite correctly, treated Lindsay as a hero. As Paul Harasim wrote in his column in the *Houston Post*: Alan Lindsay "got sick to his stomach when he found out what his political party had done. That's good to hear."

Mike Dunn concluded that "I am disgusted; the Party of Principle seems incapable of being a party of decency."

The only apology forthcoming to Jeniece LaCross after her appearance was signed not by Walter or by Gingell, who led the stonewalling forces on Nat-Com, but by Joe Dehn, Secretary of the LP. It was, however, a half-baked apology, which insisted, of course, on keeping the blood

money raised by the monstrous Walter-Willis letter. Jeniece LaCross whipped back with a statement (April 29) rejecting the apology. "To be acceptable," she wrote, "your apology must be heartfelt and sincere, but as it stands this apology is incomplete." She added that to be accepted, any real apology must (1) bar such fundraising letters (as threatened by Ernsberger) in the future, (2) publish a rebuttal to the original letter in *LP News*, and (3) guarantee that the funds raised in Phillip Lear's name not be used to promote views contrary to those held by Phillip Lear. LaCross's statement received lengthy and favorable coverage in the *Austin Ameri-*

can-Statesman. Meanwhile, the formidable Michael J. Dunn, a Washington State systems analyst, and long-time Libertarian highly respected in the Party (he is, for example, Chairman of the Washington LP Judicial Committee), has joined the Lindsay-LaCross crusade. On April 10, Dunn wrote a highly effective letter denouncing the Walter-Ernsberger tactic and charging the LP with "the deceitful manipulation of a dead serviceman's reputation, and the exploitation of his family's and fiancée's grief, all for the sake of base pecuniary gain to the Party.... Are we so desperate for funds that we must stoop to such ghoulish methods?"

Dunn concluded that "I am disgusted; the Party of Principle seems incapable of being a party of decency." Finally, in a recent letter to National Director Nick Dunbar (May 13) Dunn thoroughly summarizes the entire affair, castigates the Walter policy as "hearse chasing," and denounced the evasions, untruths, and inconsistencies of the LP reaction to the entire affair. A particularly perceptive note: "For anyone associated with the normal human race [clearly not including the Party!], in which respect for the dead is taken for granted, the popular reaction has been predictably adverse to the Party...."

Ladies and gentlemen of the Libertarian Party and its ruling clique, the Lear-LaCross issue will not go away; it cannot, because you have not made restitution, you have not regretted your odious actions, and you continue to blame the truth-teller instead of yourselves. And this is only the beginning of the revelations of self-destruction that will put an end to this

excessiveness on the American body politic.

There are all sorts of possibilities. There is a strong possibility that Lindsay might run for President at the 1991 Chicago LP convention on an Abolitionist ticket—that is, dedicated to one mighty platform plank: immediate abolition and dissolution of the irredeemably corrupt Libertarian Party. It is also very possible that Jeniece LaCross who, ironically enough, turns out to be a great admirer of Libertarian principle and the Libertarian platform, might run for national chairwoman on the same Abolitionist ticket.

The fascinating thing is that such an Abolitionist race is a no-lose situation. For even if the Abolitionists lose the election, the Party, and the media so sought after by the LP, will have to listen to the Abolitionists at convention after convention, and so the entire LP will become a much deserved laughing-stock to the media and to the real world. What kind of a party is it where those within who call for its dissolution make enormous good sense?

The Libertarian Party is a walking corpse that lacks the good sense to lie down and disappear. Its burial rites are just around the corner.

(Those interested in finding out or even joining the LaCross crusade may send a check for \$5 made out to Jeniece LaCross for all the clippings and correspondence, and more for any contributions they may wish to make to the crusade. Write and send checks to: Jeniece LaCross, 3335 Westminster Drive, S.E., Port Orchard, WA 98366.)

—M.N.R.

“You Are Now Entering...”

Ever feel like you're living in the *Twilight Zone*? I did, when the general secretary of the Communist Party of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics talked free-market economics. And he did it to American leftists.

At a luncheon in the Soviet Embassy, with guests like John Kenneth Galbraith, Jane Fonda, Robert Redford, and Jesse Jackson, Mikhail Gorbachev praised America. This, reported the *Washington Times*, bothered the Hollywood types, who—all zillionaires, of course—denounced the “greed” of the “Reagan years” and other American atrocities. Gorbachev looked baffled, and an embarrassed Soviet aide later explained that Raisa had been “dying to meet some movie stars.”

Then Gorbachev, appropriately enough for Washington, D.C., belittled the welfare mentality. “Those who do not work, who only are waiting for government handouts, yes, of course, it will be hard for them.” Jesse Jackson almost choked on his caviar.

Soviet economists, said Gorbachev, must “twist their brains” to create a free-market economy. “The Soviet people” must overcome their “traditional perception of the market as exploitative.” They must learn to live “without state

subsidies.” Americans, on the other hand, are blessed. They “know what a market is.” They understand “all its intricacies,” while “we are innocent, so to speak.”

Now it was Galbraith's turn to look rattled. His whole life has been devoted to central planning, and here the top communist is preaching capitalism. It was almost too much for the rich Harvard professor to bear.

Not that Gorbachev's own record is what it ought to be. He is, in effect, seeking to cure a dying patient slowly rather than all at once.

Thus he risks catastrophe. Given the nature of Soviet socialism, the reforms must be quick and all-encompassing.

What the U.S.S.R. needs most, as economist Ludwig von Mises showed 70 years ago, is private property. Land could be turned over to the peasants and

factories to the workers, thus actually putting the old Leninist slogan into effect. Without private property, there can be no price system, and without a price system, the economy must be a poverty machine.

Gorbachev should also take Fed Governor Wayne Angell's advice and back the ruble with gold, making it one of the strongest currencies in the world. And

What the U.S.S.R. needs most, as economist Ludwig von Mises showed 70 years ago, is private property.